

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DON REGAN: AN ELOQUENT
SPOKESMAN FOR THE REAGAN
REVOLUTION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege to be in the audience to hear White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan's remarks to the Center for the Study of the Presidency where he received the Distinguished Service Award. He spoke eloquently of the accomplishments of the Reagan administration, and gave a more personal side of the President's leadership and strength of will—qualities that have helped transform that national mood to one of pride and optimism about the future.

We in Congress have had the opportunity to work with President Reagan on various issues, and we can see the evidence of the new beginning he has given our Nation and the free world. However, Donald Regan works with the President on a day-to-day basis, and plays an important role in shaping the policies that are at the core of the Reagan revolution. I commend Don's provocative speech to my colleagues, and hope every Member will find it of interest.

MR. REGAN'S REMARKS: THE CENTER FOR THE
STUDY OF THE PRESIDENCY

Ladies and gentlemen, for two decades the Center for the Study of the Presidency has sought to shed light upon a peculiar institution. Theodore Roosevelt called the office a "bully pulpit." Roosevelt may have been too bully to his successor, William Howard Taft; Taft, it's said, referred to the office as "the loneliest place on Earth." And shortly after his inauguration, Harry Truman said to the press corps, "When they told me yesterday what had happened, I felt like the moon, the stars, and all the planets had fallen on me." As Chief of Staff, I understand the part about getting hit by falling objects.

But in the midst of shifting and often contradictory viewpoints on the Presidency, the Center has provided high standards of scholarship and genuine understanding. This award from the Center represents a high honor indeed. I must add that I feel likewise honored by the presence here tonight of so many I deeply respect—scholars whose work I admire, friends from the business world, colleagues in the Administration. Dr. Hoxie, the Center's president, is an old friend. He is also a man who served with distinction in World War II, who rose in the Air Force to become a brigadier general, and who has had a long and distinguished career in education. Thank you, Dr. Hoxie, for those king words. Dr. Farkas, the Center's chairman, is another friend. Our Ambassador to Luxembourg under Presidents Nixon and Ford, Dr. Farkas has served the Center selflessly for the past 6 years. Thank you, Dr. Farkas, for this fine plaque.

Bill Marriott, our master of ceremonies, is a man whose business acumen I admire and

whose patriotism I esteem. I appreciate your efforts, Bill, and those of your vice chairmen, in arranging this dinner. Elizabeth Dole—well, I don't suppose Liddy Dole needs any introduction in this town. Suffice it to say that she serves President Reagan with savvy, with style, and with a quality that's often rare in government—a sense of humor. She also has a persistent quality that won't take "no" for an answer—I know—I have to deal with her regularly and she's remaking me into a "yes" man.

There are so many others, so many good friends. I can't possibly summon up the phrases to tell you how grateful I feel, so permit me to use those two old, simple words—and let you know that they come from my heart: My friends, thank you.

But the assignment of making a speech before this distinguished group is one that I approach with trepidation. Much of what I have to tell you, you will already have heard. Standing before so many presidential scholars and others who have worked for, or with Presidents, indeed, I'm reminded of the story about a man who drowned in the Johnstown flood. When the man got to heaven, St. Peter told him an audience had gathered to hear the latest news from Earth. "No problem," he told St. Peter, "I'll talk about the flood I was just in." St. Peter answered, "Better make it good. The bearded fellow in the front row is Noah."

But perhaps my perspective as Chief of Staff has permitted me certain insights that will prove of interest; and if I may, I'd like to spend a few moments considering the place of the Reagan Presidency in the second half of the 20th century, the period since Franklin Roosevelt established the modern presidency itself. Permit me first to present in broad outline a number of developments that took place during these decades—and to begin with a word about my own vantage point when this period began, more than 40 years ago.

During the final years of the Roosevelt Presidency, I found myself serving as a major in the Marine Corps in the Pacific. The battle conditions we encountered were, to paraphrase Churchill, not uneventful—planes roaring overhead, ships pounding their guns, the islands themselves seeming to shudder; landing on beaches under heavy fire, pursuing a dogged enemy through jungle or over rock. All this has of course been described in detail by historians and journalists, and I mention it only because I believe it throws light on the sense of unity and mission that our Nation then evinced. Freedom, democracy, opportunity for the common man—all these we considered worth fighting for, and yes, if need be, worth dying for.

When the war ended, as we were leaving the service, the country was alive with a sense of expectation, an eagerness to go on from the destruction of combat to the challenges of peacetime. Economists and many politicians of course made dire predictions. When war production ended, they claimed, recession would follow. Massive Government intervention would be needed. Nothing of the kind happened. The economy began to grow. We were able to assist our

allies, and our former enemies, in rebuilding their shattered lands. And I would submit that this economic creativity was but one aspect of a wider creativity that permeated the culture as the rest of the world turned to America as its leader. Although in the sixties and seventies it became fashionable to portray the decade of the fifties as dull or square—a period culturally inert—in fact it was anything but that.

"Not since the 1920's," Professor Jeffrey Hart of Dartmouth writes in his book on the fifties, "had so much been happening, both in popular and in high culture. . . . For the first time in history, New York was the art capital of the world. . . . In philosophy and theology, important things were happening. And the Nation as a whole experienced an unprecedented burst of prosperity, of home buying, car owning, and, of course, television." New inventions, some of them as a result of wartime innovation, came to market, spawning new growth industries. More marriages and the baby boom produced a challenge to our economy to keep pace.

There were indeed exceptions, some drastic. Black Americans in particular still suffered severe discrimination, but they were able to make some progress. All in all, though, the country took a justifiable pride in itself. Hart writes, "Americans felt good about themselves and their country during the fifties."

The sixties began with a sense of promise—then of promise betrayed.

Here are the words of John Kennedy as he campaigned for President at the outset of the decade. "Can the world exist half slave and half free * * *? The enemy is lean and hungry, and the United States is the only sentinel at the gate. . . . Extraordinary efforts are called for by every American who knows the value of freedom." Yet by the time of John Kennedy's death, the Soviet Union had established itself and communism in Cuba, and the United States had sent soldiers to Vietnam.

There followed two decades of national agony. The bitter fiascos of Vietnam and Watergate preoccupied our leaders and brought low the presidency itself.

Throughout the world, the Soviets advanced. Between 1960 and 1980, the list of countries under Soviet domination grew to include Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, South Yemen, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Angola, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua. The United States, meanwhile, suffered a profound economic disturbance. By 1980, inflation had risen to 12 percent and the prime rate of interest had reached more than 20 percent, the highest level since the Civil War; our Gross National Product had virtually stopped growing.

The mood of the country during this period went sour. It was as if the youthfulness and exuberance of the fifties had been replaced by old age—anxious, bitter, self-deprecating. Americans of my generation could hardly believe what they had witnessed—from victory in world war to vasillation and self-doubt in less than two decades. Younger Americans—Americans who had known nothing else—accepted it as a re-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ceived fact that they lived in a Nation in decline. Few were proud of this Nation, most were bewildered. Even though we spent more we got less. Our trade picture was gloomy, our dollar weak, and many felt capitalism itself was on trial.

This, then, is the background against which Ronald Reagan took office as the 40th President of the United States.

Agree with him or not, virtually all observers admit that the President arrived with a coherent plan of action and moved at once to put it into effect. On the economic front, the President cut taxes dramatically and asked the Federal Reserve Board to steady the growth of our money supply to bring inflation to an end. He curtailed the growth of Federal regulations, de-regulated financial institutions, and began using anti-trust policy to encourage competition and benefit consumers.

The result? A very difficult period of adjustment, a recession of 18 months. Yet since then, the return to economic health has been dramatic: Forty months of economic growth. Inflation down to roughly 3 percent. Interest rates down and Government bond rates back to the levels of the early seventies. Close to 10 million new jobs. And the stock market competing with the bond market in setting one record after another.

One of the President's economic achievements deserves special mention. On taking office, the President completely de-controlled the price of oil. This set off a search for new sources of oil and other forms of energy in our own country which, when coupled with vast deposits of oil and natural gas found elsewhere, forced down the price of oil. OPEC has been rendered largely ineffective, and it's once again possible to tank up for under 10 bucks—Iaccoca in his Chrysler and me in my Mercury. To be sure, some sectors must undergo a difficult adjustment as a result of the new lower prices. But because President Reagan set them free to do so, consumers were able to use the free market to take on OPEC—and win.

Today, even the President's alleged economic failing, the growth of the Federal deficit, appears to be coming under control. Yes, the deficit has grown quickly, and we've been concerned about it. As a percentage of GNP, however, the Federal debt has grown for the most part in line with historical standards. And with the outlook calling for continued economic growth, this—the deficit monster that just a few months ago was supposed to swallow the Reagan Presidency—is beginning to shrink. Indeed, it now appears clear that with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings assisting the process, the deficit can be whittled down to zero if we have the will to fight more spending.

In foreign policy, again, the President has acted decisively. When he took office, America's underlying military structure—the factor on which all diplomacy depends—lay in weakness. During virtually the entire decade of the seventies, we had failed to make major capital investments in defense and had barely met replacement costs. Our naval fleet, for example, had fallen from nearly a thousand ships to under 500. The President immediately set in train a rebuilding program, signaling the world that the United States was returning to the global scene in an active way. Today there is still much to be done, but our military strength has been substantially re-established, and we are once again universally respected.

In nuclear policy, the President's Strategic Defense Initiative has challenged the as-

sumptions that have dominated strategic planning since the end of the War. There is an irony here. Critics have referred to the President as a Cold Warrior, a man whose ideas are out of date. Now Ronald Reagan has asked a simple question: "Why not a defense that defends—a defense that actually protects our people by keeping missiles from reaching the United States in the first place?" And with that question, the President who is supposedly behind the times has made his critics look old-fashioned—they still want the threat of mutual destruction as a deterrent.

The fruits of the President's foreign policy are already clear. In the more than 5 years since he took office, not one inch of territory has fallen to the Communists, and one nation, Grenada, has been set free. With our military strength re-established, the President was able to hold a successful summit meeting with the Soviet leader, Mr. Gorbachev, and to invite Mr. Gorbachev to visit the United States for a second summit meeting this year. At the same time, the President has extended material support to those struggling against the Soviet empire, and now in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, and Nicaragua, the forces of democracy are winning new recruits.

In a wider sense, the United States has once again become an economic and political model for the rest of the world. Witness the establishment of democracy in six Latin American nations since the President took office. And witness the way in which the free-market aspects of the Reagan revolution are being picked up around the globe. China has moved to free markets dramatically. The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank are preaching market economic and equity financing as an antidote to state socialism and large debts. In the Philippines, Jaime Ongpin, the new finance minister, has said, quote, "I am philosophically committed to the absolute minimum of government interference." And in France, voters have supported freer markets and more private enterprise.

Here at home, a profound change—a sea-change—has taken place in the mood and outlook of the country. Indications of renewed social health abound. Student test scores are up, crime rates are down, personal donations to charity are running at an all-time high. The President of the United States can go to a college campus and get cheered. As I noted earlier, Jeffrey Hart wrote of the fifties, "By and large, Americans felt good about themselves and their country. . . ." For perhaps the first time in the three decades since, this is once again the case. We cheer our athletes in international competition, and applaud our military as they show our flag.

Economic growth, a successful foreign policy, a newly patriotic and self-confident Nation—why should this be? Is it that President Reagan's policies are technically superior to those of his predecessors? Is it simply that Ronald Reagan is in some marginal or incremental sense better at his job? The answer, I believe, has less to do with technical superiority than with the President's most fundamental beliefs about this country—in a word, with Ronald Reagan's vision of America.

Recently I came upon a passage that illuminates this very point, the distinction between incremental improvements and the matter of vision. Arthur Schlesinger writes in his biography of Robert Kennedy that, before the 1960 debates between John Kennedy and Richard Nixon, Henry Kissinger

provided some advice. "We need someone . . ." Kissinger said, "who will take a big jump—not just improve on existing trends but produce a new frame of mind, a new national atmosphere. . . . The issue is not one technical program or another. The issue is a new epoch. If we get a new epoch and a new spirit, the technical programs will take care of themselves."

Two decades later, Ronald Reagan produced just that, a new epoch and spirit. I would add that President Reagan's vision is not only new, but ancient—as ancient indeed as Athens and Jerusalem. For at its most fundamental level, President Reagan's vision is the vision of all Western civilization—the belief in a just and loving God, in individual responsibility, in the importance of the family. By reasserting, for example, the ancient belief in the goodness of creation—a belief advanced in Genesis—President Reagan has reawakened our sense of the goodness of our own people and land. And by reasserting the ancient belief that history has meaning—that human existence is a vast story ultimately unfolding according to the will of its almighty Author—President Reagan has opened our eyes to the importance of America's place and mission in this story, as the bastion of human freedom in our time.

This restoration of a sense of meaning, I believe, has a great deal to do with the recent emergence of so many new democracies. Not long ago, it was the communist model that was attractive to much of the Third World—Fidel Castro was a cultural hero in Latin America and posters of Che Guevara appeared around the globe. Those of us in Western democracies were puzzled. Why, we asked, does communism hold so much appeal for the Third World when it so obviously requires the surrender of human liberty?

The answer was that in many parts of the world, the freedoms we enjoyed had never been known. To quote the historian Christopher Dawson, "In [many places] life has been short and hard and uncertain. . . . In such a world the evils of totalitarianism which shock the Western mind—its denial of personal liberty, of freedom of opinion and free enterprise—are less apparent. . . . Communism demands everything . . . but in return it makes men feel that there is a power watching over them which is immune from human weakness and is based on an unchanging foundation of absolute principles." However falsely, in other words, communism offered to oppressed peoples a sense that their lives had meaning. By comparison, Western democracies often appeared adrift, meaningless, gripped by anxiety and self-doubt.

Now, however, President Reagan has restated the Western belief that democracy represents, not just a way of organizing society for the production of wealth, but a means by which men can participate in the life of their nation and in history itself. Democracy, he has made clear, is based upon ancient and coherent values. It arises from a view of the universe as meaningful, and itself serves as a source of meaning for men's lives.

As the President has reasserted these truths, the Soviet Union has become more and more clearly, in the words of George Will, "an invalid trapped in a bureaucracy drunk on a 19th century fallacy Marxism. . . . It is a system being driven toward suffocation and anemia. . . ." Far from burying the United States, communism is burying itself. And from the green mountains of

Nicaragua to the green islands of the Philippines, the world conflict has entered a new and perhaps decisive phase. Now it is democracy that is on the offensive: the dictators, totalitarians, and state socialists who are on guard and fearful.

Permit me to turn now from the wider world to the White House and to Ronald Reagan, the man himself. The President's humor, his grace, the way he puts those around him at ease—all these are well known. But there is one aspect of the President that I would like to discuss on the public record, an aspect that has struck me again and again since becoming his Chief of Staff, all the more forcefully on this point since the public perception—or rather the public cliché—seems to me badly mistaken. Let me speak for a moment of the President's mind.

Now, as the former chairman of a large corporation, it has been my privilege to work with some very bright men and women, some with analytical skills as finely honed as any in the world. Yet despite the number and complexity of the issues we dealt with on Wall Street, all lay within the same field, the field of finance. Again at the Treasury Department, the issues were complex but closely connected. When I moved to the White House, I found a completely different intellectual environment. Issues come at the President furiously all day, and what strikes me is how utterly different they can be from one another. Let me give you, for example, the President's schedule for a recent day, March 20th.

9:00 a.m. With the Vice President and the Chief of Staff, the President goes over the events and issues of the day ahead. Topics touched on include the developing crisis in the Gulf of Sidra; votes in Congress on Nicaragua; the budget, which is getting nowhere in Congress; and the latest maneuvering on taxes.

9:30 a.m. The President receives his national security briefing. Much of this meeting was classified, but I can tell you that time was again spent on the Gulf of Sidra, as well as the rest of the Middle East.

9:45-10:30 a.m. The President holds a series of staff meetings, during which the issues discussed range from agriculture to the American machine tool industry.

10:30 a.m. The President begins a series of telephone calls to key Senators and Representatives. The calls focus on aid to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters.

Noon. The President has his weekly luncheon with the Vice President. As always, this luncheon is kept in confidence so that both men can speak their minds with complete freedom. I can tell you, however, that while this luncheon was informal, a great deal of serious business got done.

1:00 p.m. The President gives an interview to the New York Times. The issues discussed included aid to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters, the space shuttle program, the Philippines, the budget, and relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

1:15 p.m. The President tapes a message for the National Fitness Foundation.

1:30 p.m. The President meets his personnel director and makes decisions on a number of appointments throughout the Federal Government.

2:00 p.m. The President welcomes Congressmen and other guests for the signing of the Agriculture Day Proclamation.

2:05-4:30 p.m. The President holds a series of staff meetings. Issues discussed include the Gulf of Sidra and the options at his disposal in the context of SALT II.

4:30-5:00 p.m. The President presents an award for courage to a young cancer victim and poses for photographs with a number of people, including—and nothing illustrates the variety of the presidential day more clearly than this—the concert pianist Vladimir Horowitz and the middle-weight boxing champion, Marvelous Marvin Hagler.

5:00 p.m. The President leaves the Oval Office for the Residence, under his arm a thick folder of homework, including speech drafts, issues papers, and a sheaf of documents for his signature.

In the midst of days like this, the President remains affable and serene. He does so because his mind is disciplined and resilient. Perhaps more effectively than any other man I have known, the President is able to give his full concentration to the issue at hand; then take a deep breath, clear his mind, and give the same concentration to the next matter he deals with—whether a crisis in the Gulf of Sidra or a photograph with Marvelous Marvin. This, then, is the mind—flexible, trained, insightful, comprehensive—at the center of the Reagan Presidency.

How to sum it all up—the Presidency, the man himself? In his televised speech on Nicaragua, the President himself quoted Clare Boothe Luce's observation that, "no matter how exalted or great a man may be, history will have time to give him no more than one sentence. George Washington—he founded our country. Abraham Lincoln—he freed the slaves and preserved the Union. Winston Churchill—he saved Europe."

Of course it is too early to predict the single sentence with which Ronald Reagan will be remembered, but as I consider the possibilities, I find one line repeatedly coming to mind. It is the epigram with which Scott Fitzgerald summarized his feelings about our country. He wrote, "America is a willingness of the heart."

I don't suppose when I was a Marine those 40 years ago I had ever come across that line—I don't suppose any of my buddies had, either. But we knew what it expressed. We knew what it meant to love our country—and to look to the future with confidence because we had been born free.

Today, I sense the same exuberance among the young. They too know what it means to love our country and to look to the years ahead with a sense of expectation. They too look at the world around them and in their own way thank God for the gift of freedom. So it is that the Fitzgerald line seems fitting. Not so much as Chief of Staff, but as an ordinary American who loves his country, I am more grateful than words can express, that the President of the United States has restored to our green and gentle land its willingness of heart.

Thank you.

REFRESHING REVIEW OF THE PROSPECTS FOR THE SDI

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the recently published book, "Strategic Defense: 'Star Wars' in Perspective," by Dr. Keith B. Payne, is an important contribution to the continuing public debate and assessment process regarding the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Dr. Payne is an articulate exponent of the SDI Program

and well versed in the relationships between the SDI and nuclear deterrence, strategy, stability, and other key arms control aspects of the program. Moreover, he demonstrates significant sensitivity to overriding questions such as U.S. commitments to allies and the morality of nuclear deterrence. There is no better way to describe Dr. Payne's contribution than the excellent foreword to the book written by Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. Dr. Brzezinski has impressive credentials in the defense policy arena, having served as National Security Adviser to President Carter and as a key adviser to the U.S. Government for several decades. His objective, yet very complimentary foreword to Dr. Payne's book, follows:

FOREWORD

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski)

When President Reagan announced the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) in a televised speech on March 23, 1983, he directed the U.S. technical community to investigate the potential for constructing a highly effective defense against ballistic missiles. The long-term goal of this investigation, as presented by the president, was to provide the technology necessary for nothing short of "rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete." Since that March 23rd presentation, labeled by the media as the president's "Star Wars" speech, there has been a deluge of articles and editorials on the subject of strategic defense. Despite the apparent general scarcity of understanding concerning what the SDI is and is not there has been no lack of commentary. This book provides an extremely useful guide to anyone interested in understanding the nature of the SDI and the debate surrounding it—a debate which may prove to be one of the most important of our times.

Current technical and political circumstances make the decision to proceed with an SDI eminently sensible. The development of ballistic missile technology has led to accuracies that could potentially enable Soviet offensive forces to pose a first-strike threat to an effective U.S. retaliatory response and to almost all U.S. command and control facilities. The fact that the Soviet Union has deployed large numbers of highly accurate offensive forces in its arsenal of ICBMs and continues to add to that arsenal, while the United States has not, is particularly disturbing. Indeed, even if the U.S. strategic modernization program were carried out over the coming decade as currently envisaged, our strategic arsenal would not possess "counterforce" capabilities equal to those of the Soviet Union.

It has long been held as a near-truth that as long as the U.S. could threaten to retaliate effectively the Soviet Union would be discouraged from contemplating a first strike. However, the Soviet strategic build-up and its ICBM deployments in particular constitute a danger to the continued effectiveness of the U.S. deterrent. Concern over the continuing build-up of the Soviet capability to destroy our retaliatory forces and command and control facilities in a first strike does not reflect an exaggeration of the threat to stability posed by these Soviet forces. Indeed, we have been watching the momentum of the Soviet counterforce build-up for years—realizing that if arms control negotiations could not provide a solution we would be compelled to provide for our security unilaterally. It is now possible to conceive of circumstances under which the Soviet Union could strike first and de-

stroy most of our land-based retaliatory forces. Only those ballistic missile carrying submarines on patrol might survive the Soviet attack; and the doubtful ability to communicate with those surviving submarines following attack on our communications facilities would likely reduce their retaliatory potential.

The American hope has been that these destabilizing trends in offensive technology could be handled through a political process, i.e., arms control. However, it is doubtful that strategic arms control negotiations, as we have come to know them, possess the capacity to produce the expected stabilizing limitations on offensive counterforce weapons. The position adopted by the Soviet Union in the current talks at Geneva suggests that the political route will continue to be fruitless unless we go forward with a credible SDI program. Of particular importance is the emphasis the SDI places upon near-term defensive technologies appropriate for defense coverage of American retaliatory capabilities. A credible SDI emphasizing such a defensive potential will facilitate reductions in destabilizing offensive arms, such as the over 600 Soviet SS-18 and SS-19 ICBMs (and their successors). It will do so by allowing our negotiators to present their Soviet counterparts with two options, one mutually beneficial, the other particularly costly to the Soviet Union.

The first option would be to renegotiate ABM Treaty restrictions against the defense of retaliatory forces. In return for real reductions in modern counterforce-capable ICBMs, of which the Soviet Union possesses the vast majority, the United States would agree not to proceed with deployment of its strategic defense system. If the Soviet Union refuses this bargain the U.S. would declare that the continued Soviet offensive buildup has placed in jeopardy supreme American interests and that the U.S. consequently is compelled to withdraw from the ABM Treaty. Such an action would both reflect the truth concerning Soviet ICBM deployments and be consistent with Article 15 of the Treaty governing legal withdrawal. Following withdrawal from the Treaty the U.S. would deploy a BMD system for protection of its strategic retaliatory capabilities. This action would nullify the decade-long Soviet deployment of counterforce-capable ICBMs. If the Soviet response was to increase its ICBM arsenal in an attempt to re-establish its threat to our retaliatory forces, the Soviets would be engaging in a losing tailchase that would be excessively costly for them. It would be easier and cheaper for the U.S. to augment its defenses and restore the survivability of its retaliatory capability than it would be for the Soviet Union to attempt to overturn those defenses through an increase in its offensive threat.

In order to pursue such an approach to strategic defense and arms control the United States must revise the current orientation of the SDI. The Reagan Administration has focused the emphasis of the SDI on those "exotic" technologies that might one day provide effective protection for large urban areas. It has given less emphasis to the near-term potential for the defense of selected strategic retaliatory forces—although there is general agreement that such defensive capabilities are now or soon will be in hand. To provide the necessary impetus for real Soviet offensive arms reductions, the SDI must convince Moscow's leadership of our capability and willingness to deploy a strategy defense system soon if it continues to reject significant limitations

on destabilizing offensive forces. The Soviet Union must also be convinced that we will be willing to forego BMD deployment if they are willing to make the stabilizing reductions in their offensive missile force we have long sought. It should be clear that to pursue such a meaningful negotiating posture and defense strategy the U.S. requires a credible near-term BMD program. Support for the SDI is thus support for any future prospects for real reductions through arms control.

In this book Keith Payne documents the case for the SDI and strategic defense in terms of arms control and strategic stability. Without making utopian claims for the potential efficacy of defensive systems, Dr. Payne provides an innovative strategy for increasing American security and obtaining genuine arms control through a combination of defensive and offensive modernization programs.

Dr. Payne's emphasis on the necessity for both defensive and offensive programs may prove controversial. Nonetheless, he provides a strong and balanced case for the integration of offensive and defensive systems in support of strategic stability and arms control. Indeed, because Keith Payne is able to weave offense, defense and arms control into a single strategy this book will prove to be a major contribution not only to the debate over the SDI, but also to the much larger debate over the general direction that American strategy should take in coming decades.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT 1985

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit my 1985 personal financial statement for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This statement is a complete disclosure of my 1985 income, assets, and liabilities which I have done every year since entering office in 1973.

Congressman Gerry E. Studds' 1985 Financial Statement

Part I—Income 1985 (summary):	
Salary.....	\$74,892.00
Dividends—See part II for detailed explanation.....	1,262.00
Interest—See part III for detailed explanation.....	2,208.00
Honoraria—See part IV for detailed explanation.....	2,750.00
Total income.....	81,112.00
Part II—Dividend income 1985:	
No. Shares—Security: Income derived 1985	
40—Burlington Industries	66.00
347—Exxon.....	1,196.00
Total.....	1,262.00
Part III—Interest Income 1985:	
Bonds—Security:	
\$3,100.00—Lorillard, Inc. 6% debenture	213.00
3,333.00—U.S. Treasury 12 percent, May 15, 1987.....	400.00
Bank accounts:	
Bank of Boston (NOW).....	55.00
American Security Bank (NOW & MMA).....	1,540.00
Total.....	2,208.00

Part IV—Honoraria 1985:

Human Rights Campaign Fund, Washington, DC	625.00
Michigan Organization for Human Rights, Detroit, MI.....	500.00
Lambda Center, Allentown, PA ..	1,250.00
Stonewall Union, Columbus, OH.....	375.00
Total.....	2,750.00

Part V—Assets:

1. Beatrice Studds Irrevocable Trust: My brother, Colin A. Studds, my sister, Mrs. Howard Babcock, and I have placed the following securities—owned jointly by the three of us—in an irrevocable trust for our mother, Beatrice Studds, with my brother as trustee. All income from these securities goes to our mother for as long as she shall live. My brother, my sister, and I each own one-third of the securities—and they will revert to us upon the dissolution of the trust at our mother's death. The following represents my one-third interest in the trust:

Colin A. Studds, III, Trustee Beatrice Studds, irrevocable trust, under agreement dated Aug. 1, 1973

No. shares—Security:	Market value
5,000.000—U.S. Treasury 13.875 note, due Nov. 15, 1986.....	5,000.00
Common stock:	
133—West Point Pepperell	7,086.00
67—W.R. Grace.....	3,283.00
50—General Motors	4,150.00
33—IBM.....	5,066.00
167—Detroit Edison	3,173.00
112—Munford.....	2,352.00
183—Park Electro-Chemical.....	3,300.00
167—Rogers Corporation	3,841.00
67—Eastman Kodak.....	4,020.00
167—Toledo Edison.....	4,008.00
67—GTE.....	3,484.00
133—Home Group	3,866.00
2. I own the following securities:	
No. Shares—Security:	
Bonds:	
\$3,100.00—Lorillard, Inc. 6% debenture.....	2,666.00
3,333.00—U.S. Treasury 12 percent, May 15, 1987	3,333.00
Common Stocks:	
40—Burlington Industries ..	1,520.00
347—Exxon	19,432.00
200—PBA	00.00
3. Our family home in Cohasset, Massachusetts, with an estimated market value of approximately \$300,000 is owned jointly by my brother, my sister and me. My interest in the home therefore, is roughly	
	100,000.00
4. Bank Accounts:	
a. NOW account, First National Bank of Boston	850.00
b. NOW account, American Security Bank.....	1,500.00
c. Money Market Account, American Security Bank	11,000.00
d. NOW account, Seamen's Savings Bank	100.00

5. Two bedroom house in Provincetown, Mass., estimated market value	400,000.00
6. Efficiency Condominium Apartment, Washington, DC estimated market value	52,000.00
7. 1981 Chevrolet Caprice	4,600.00
8. 1985 Jeep Wagoneer	15,400.00
9. IRA—Fidelity Magellan Fund	13,000.00
Part VI—Liabilities 1985:	
1. Mortgage, two bedroom house, Provincetown, MA, New Bedford Institution for Savings, approximately.....	206,000.00
2. Mortgage, efficiency condominium, Washington, DC, Home Unity Savings and Loan.....	41,000.00

AMERICA'S COMPETITIVENESS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, last month, a number of business leaders, university presidents, and Members of Congress gathered at Hot Springs, VA, to discuss one of the most vital and challenging issues of our times—America's competitiveness. It is an issue that touches every aspect of this Nation's institutions and our declining position in the international economy. Those of us who attended the conference dealt with the range of issues that contribute to our national potential and what we need to do as a Nation to restore our competitive position.

The reports and recommendations that will be forthcoming from the Hot Springs conference and three previous sessions on competitiveness around the country will help to lay the groundwork for the task before us all.

The keynote address was given by the Chairwoman of the International Trade Commission, Dr. Paula Stern. More than anyone else, Dr. Stern sees the evidence of our declining competitiveness. Industries impeded by imports—and often experiencing a loss of competitiveness—usually appear before the ITC seeking relief.

While Dr. Stern and I may not agree on every point, her address, "The U.S. Trade System and the National Interest: Can We Do Better?" offers a sobering account of our trade problems and several thought-provoking suggestions on how America could recover her competitive position.

I hope my colleagues will take time to read the text of Dr. Stern's address:

THE U.S. TRADE SYSTEM AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST: CAN WE DO BETTER?

(By Dr. Paula Stern)

Thank you for including me in this impressive gathering of thinkers and doers.

Analysis and action tend to get separated in official Washington, and as David Stockman admits, even in Washington's officials. When the payoff for bad policy advice is a big publishers' advance, it may be time to move your Forum from temporary quarters in Virginia to permanent location on the north bank of the Potomac. As a Southerner, and a Washingtonian, I would be happy to offer you hospitality.

The Forum has already stimulated important departures in national education policy. Now I hope you will be as persistent and successful in the field of competitiveness. It is an honor to take part in your work.

I. WE HAVE A CRISIS

I do not exaggerate when I say that international trade has become a matter of national security. Our power in the world has become as much a function of the balance of trade as of the balance of terror. And our future depends as surely on our grain silos as on our missile silos.

Yet while we are used to strategic thinking about defense matters and strategic planning for corporate policy, we have settled for improvisation in international commerce. The result is crisis—six years of record trade deficits and a seventh big one on the way. The more important trade has become to our economy, the less well it seems we are performing.

The dimensions of the crisis, however, are now producing pressure for response. Speaking for myself and not the Commission I head, I'd like to outline six specific responses we should pursue and some broader issues we must face. It will be up to you to decide whether my advice is bad enough to qualify for a big publisher's advance.

II. REAL REMEDIES FOR U.S. TRADE PROBLEMS

I'll present my ideas as a wish list, remembering the old proverb: "If wishes were horses, beggars would ride." Since it's after dinner, this beggar will gallop.

(1) Item one on my wish list is a real commitment to consider the international effects when we set domestic monetary and fiscal policy. American industry and agriculture were put on a five-year long roller-coaster ride by policies which ignored, yet indirectly fanned the value of the dollar. Last fall, the Administration changed its tune, and there has been a healthy, if overdue, weakening of the dollar.

But even so, we will not easily or painlessly recoup the jobs we lost at home and the sales we missed abroad. The dollar's decline cannot completely "solve" our trade problem. It will have an impact on our Japanese and European Community accounts, but Canada—our single biggest trading partner—has devalued its dollar faster than ours.

The dollar is also stronger—not weaker—against the currencies of Mexico, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Brazil, Venezuela, and Australia. Thus, the overall decline of the dollar will not by itself solve all the trade problems we have been experiencing.

(2) The most prominent single economic event of this year is the reverse oil shock of 1986. Since oil is priced in dollars, this decline in price will be magnified for those countries whose currencies have appreciated against the dollar—Japan, West Germany and the remainder of the European Community.

Growth in these economies will increase their domestic demand, help restrain their exports, and possibly stimulate imports from the U.S. But these countries need not have waited for the fortuitous oil glut. Having waited, they are still not doing enough.

So my second wish is that we continue to pressure the governments of Japan and Europe to adopt more expansive economic policies. If we are successful, there will be a welcome bonus for the indebted third world, which could then look to other markets for increased export sales.

(3) Meanwhile at home, we should economize on the time and political energy we spend on secondary problems.

To explain staggering trade deficits of recent years, we have to look beyond the ways in which foreigners close their markets . . . and abuse our hospitality. After all, last year, less than one percent of the total value of U.S. imports was even challenged before the ITC. And in the vast majority of the cases we probed, an affirmative Commission ruling would only have resulted in marginally raising the price of imports, not in eliminating them.

Thus, unfair trade practices of other nations, however, vexing to individual U.S. industries, are not the chief menace to America. It's time to recognize this reality. That is item three on my list.

(4) My fourth wish is that we move beyond improvising trade policy. We should begin by fully examining the costs and benefits of all our options before, not after, we act. For instance, last December the ITC found that the President's steel import restraint program—if it works as planned—will cost U.S. exporters of steel-containing products over \$15 billion. The higher costs for steel they will face here will translate into higher prices for their products and hence lost sales abroad. Unfortunately, this calculation of export disadvantage was requested and aired only well after the import restraint program was underway.

(5) Wish number five is that we change the way we approach legislation affecting trade. Historically, we have written trade laws, not competitiveness legislation. As we have worked to liberalize international commerce, we have also created exemptions or shelters for declining or particularly powerful domestic industries.

Many laws offer U.S. claimants relief from the strain of trade competition. But an approach that focuses narrowly on imports often overlooks more basic causes of competitive decline.

(6) My sixth wish is that the law be changed to require that when the ITC recommends relief, we give the President more than the current take-it-or-leave-it option. The President should have a broad and deep range of choices based on an industry's competitive position and its readiness to adapt to new conditions.

With the present push for changes in our trade laws, it is clear that there will be benefits for American industry. We have an obligation to maximize the long-range returns from this public investment. And that can only be accomplished by creating the possibility of package deals that bring labor, management, and government into joint efforts that increase productivity, flexibility, and new investment.

We need not finance such efforts with new taxes or greater deficits. Instead of simply giving away import quotas to Japan, Korea and other nations, we should be auctioning them. In addition to financing adjustment here rather than abroad, auctions would put a concrete price tag on import relief, make the whole importing process more predictable, and ration quotas more efficiently. By adding positive relief to the negative relief accorded by quotas, an auctioning system could make it possible to achieve the same overall level of assistance to U.S. firms and workers with less restrictive quotas.

III. TRADE AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

I have given you six wishes. I hope you will let me take one more roll of the dice.

The character of my wish list raises a very broad question which troubles me deeply and with which I would like to close. Do we have a trade policy which reflects our true national interest?

Let me cite some specific practices and their unintended, unexamined consequences. The first is technology transfer, the not-so-innocent passage of our know-how to our partners and rivals.

Export deals, particularly military sales, often depend on barter arrangements. They regularly include obligations for transfer abroad of U.S. technology. Between 1980 and 1984, such offsets resulted in new or enhanced production of civilian aircraft or components by seven of our trading partners. Likewise, we have spread American technology to foreign electronics, communications, steel and machinery industries.

This kind of transfer is on the rise and so is the competition it fosters. It poses obvious long-term economic implications. We need to examine more closely the costs and benefits of the "free" flow of knowledge.

Another example: much of our diplomatic effort with countries like Brazil, which I visited in January, has been devoted to protecting entry rights for U.S.-based multinationals. They want to expand overseas subsidiaries which may well wind up exporting to the U.S.

We push hard for that access and not enough on opening up heavily protected Third World markets to exports of goods made in the U.S. Our negotiators seem to despair that it is a hopeless task. The banks, understanding how debtor nations pay their loans, want to see countries like Brazil import less and export more. But the stakes are too high to assume that our national interest is best pursued by making life more comfortable for our diplomats and bankers.

Now that our domestic firms once again are moving into position to challenge foreign producers on their home turf with goods made in the U.S.A., do we really want to trade that competitive revival off for the right to establish new U.S. subsidiaries abroad? Where does our real national interest lie?

Not all of our miscalculations of national interest are new in origin. Since 1789, American law has discriminated against foreign shipping to favor domestic shipping in our coastal trade. But in the process, it has also discriminated against other U.S. industries by raising their transport costs, while leaving untouched their foreign competitors who can send their wares directly to U.S. ports in foreign bottoms.

The present day incarnation of this sacred cow comes in the form of the Jones Act. It requires that all intracoastal trade be conducted in vessels built in and documented under the laws of the United States, and owned by American citizens. The restrictions are intended to provide for the national defense and the growth of foreign and domestic commerce.

But the tab for the Jones Act now goes well beyond the increased operating costs it foists on users of domestic transport. Ocean freight costs have fallen so dramatically in the last 25 years that the Jones Act itself has now become a significant impediment to supplying many regions of the U.S. with domestic rather than foreign products which are carried in much cheaper foreign bottoms.

At the ITC, we have seen sugar coming into New Orleans from Europe rather than Florida in large part because the shipping costs were cheaper from Europe. Cement is

shipped to southern California from Australia cheaper than it can be shipped from northern California. And in many areas, it is cheaper—even with the decline of the dollar—to buy foreign steel products because ocean transport from Europe or the Far East is cheaper than barge transport in the U.S. We seem to be cutting off our noses to spite our faces.

A careful new look at this politically and emotionally loaded subject could come up with changes that would foster competitiveness of regional industries in the U.S., protect legitimate national security interests in a merchant marine, and quite possibly even stimulate employment of our seamen. As it stands now, our regional industries, merchant marine, and shipbuilding all suffer. We can do better by all three.

Let me close with one subject that is for good reason a part of the liturgy of every American trade official. Consider Japan, which has a fundamental problem in the imbalance between its huge savings and relatively low domestic consumption.

The result is a flow of Japanese capital abroad rather than an inflow to Japan of exports from the U.S. and Europe. Yet, the Administration has in the past expended its diplomatic capital with Japan on serious, but nevertheless less important market access issues.

We must find new energy to press the Japanese to make whatever changes are necessary to encourage greater consumption. The exact way that "keeping up with the Joneses" will get translated into "keeping up with the Tanakas" is of course a Japanese affair. But the necessity of doing so is a fact of life given current international trade flows. We can only hope that Prime Minister Nakasone's visit will help speed the process. But this kind of change will not come easily to Japan; real progress requires continuous pressure from all Japan's trading partners.

These examples show that we have yet to develop a deep understanding of where our national interest lies. We are even further from a trade policy consistent with that interest. However troubling, we should not be surprised that there is apparently no clear expression of America's national interest in its trade policy. After all, only in the past year has there been a serious appreciation of the need for a national trade policy, one on an equal footing with macroeconomic and foreign policy.

The time has never been better for changing course. The political debate has switched gears away from the illusion of protection and toward the reality of competition. The second wind of the present recovery has given us unique possibilities of implementing a long-term perspective before the next recession again inevitably narrows our vision.

We have some difficult work ahead in forging a trade policy to replace our outdated passive approach with measures that truly promote our national interest. The issues are so fundamental that they will only be clarified when they are presented to the entire body politic, rather than just the handful of insiders who have until now generally monopolized discussion of trade issues.

I hope you will join in sorting out the issues we as a nation must face together.

Thank you.

MIMI SILBERT AND DELANCEY STREET

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, as part of a series on drug abuse, a remarkable person and an extensive innovative drug rehabilitation program were featured in yesterday's Washington Post.

The person is Dr. Mimi Silbert, one of the most talented people I know, and the program is called the Delancey Street Foundation.

Mimi Silbert and Delancey Street should serve as both an inspiration and a model for others.

I commend the Post article to my colleagues for their review and consideration:

DELANCEY STREET: FOR A FEW ADDICTS, A 4-YEAR LESSON IN LIVING

BREWSTER, N.Y.—In a 19th century oak-paneled dining room, before a long table set with sterling silver, 75 drug addicts jostled for standing room.

All eyes were fixed on a small woman with a broad, ironic smile. "Good afternoon," Mimi Silbert said. The group returned the greeting in unison, and then broke into laughter. Silbert, president of the Delancey Street Foundation drug rehabilitation program, was already playing the room like a violin.

The surroundings—a Tudor-style mansion set in 92 wooded acres about 70 miles north of New York City—seemed impossibly opulent for a drug treatment program. But they reflected Delancey Street's style, as well as its success at turning drug problems into manpower, all the while shunning government money.

The money that residents make selling stenciled coffee mugs to university bookstores, moving furniture with Delancey's fleet of trucks, or building ornamental planters at the foundation's factory puts food on the table—and working capital into the foundation's budget. In turn, addicts and criminals get a taste of what it's like to lead a normal, workaday life.

Nearly one of every three residents here was convicted in D.C. Superior Court of selling drugs, prostitution or violent crimes such as robbery or assault. They were placed on probation to come to Brewster, and before they are deemed ready to return to society, most will spend at least four years in one of three Delancey facilities in California and New Mexico, or in this 30-room, renovated castle.

During that time, they are supposed to learn to read and write; cook a meal or lay bricks; drive a truck or keep books. When they sit down to dinner, there might be oysters or snails on their plates. Silbert contends that exposure to the finer and more exotic things in life takes some of the fear out of being an addict, fear of a larger world that for them seems full of complications and problems too big to overcome without using drugs.

"Our people who stay here have to do four years just like Harvard," said Silbert, 44, a criminologist and psychologist who once counseled offenders at Lorton Reformatory's Youth Center.

"NEVER LEARNED TO MAKE THEIR WAY"

"We're dealing with a lot of people who have never learned to make their way legitimately or successfully into American society. We teach them how to do it on the assumption that you can then reject anything in society you don't like, but not because you don't know about it."

Each morning there is a new vocabulary word to learn—"ghetto talk" is strictly prohibited. Breakfast call comes at 7:30 a.m., and for the rest of the day it's work at one of the several industries, supervised by more experienced residents.

At Delancey's four facilities there is only one paid employee: Silbert. The rest of the job of managing the foundation's properties and business is left to the residents themselves, the most successful of whom move to the top of the Delancey hierarchy and the most coveted rewards, a private room and dating privileges.

The 23 D.C. convicts at Brewster, many of them unable to get into packed programs near Washington, found out about Delancey Street through their attorneys or from the brochures the foundation sends to the D.C. Jail.

Most graduates go on to lead successful lives, Silbert said, because they must have three skills and a job before they leave. So far, though, none of the D.C. enrollees has been in the program long enough to graduate.

Started in San Francisco by four addicts 15 years ago with a \$1,000 loan, Delancey Street prefers to take serious criminals, rejecting only sex offenders. Silbert said she joined the group after being asked to help write a proposal for a government grant, and later took full charge. She tries to accept all who apply, although she has had to close the doors to some in the past year because of a crush of applicants.

Melvin Peoples, a 32-year-old heroin addict and drug peddler, took the train to Brewster from Washington last year after a Superior Court judge placed him on probation following Peoples' guilty plea to a charge of trying to kill his wife.

"I didn't know where to go," said Peoples, who was turned away from at least three programs in Washington. "Either they were full up or they wouldn't accept me."

Now he is helping to install electrical wiring at the expanding Brewster complex, aiming to become a master electrician. "I'd been in it [drugs] for a long time. And this has given me a chance to see the other side, how it is without any heroin, without the craziness of the streets."

Joe Henery, 39, who grew up around 14th and U streets NW, was peddling drugs and stealing purses out of offices to support his addiction when he was caught driving a stolen car. He was placed on probation to enter Delancey Street last year and said he sees this as his last, best chance to go straight. He's got a carpentry job, turning one of the estate's outbuildings into an office.

"If I had gotten out of jail this time instead of coming to Delancey Street, . . . I probably would be dead or so far gone until wouldn't nobody even like to have anything to do with me."

RESIDENTS ATTEND FREE

In all, Silbert oversees more than \$7 million in property and other assets and \$6 million in income last year, according to a financial statement she provided. Residents attend the program free of charge.

The foundation was named for a street on New York's Lower East Side that was a

haven for immigrants at the turn of the century. Silbert said she adopted many of the ideas for Delancey's self-supporting industries from what she saw while visiting an Israeli kibbutz.

She sees addicts as people trapped in a cycle of guilt, self-hatred and destructive behavior who don't know how to cope or live with other people and who desperately need to learn traditional American values.

The surroundings at Brewster might be lush, but residents, she maintains, are doing more penance than if they were locked in a cell. They must finally take responsibility for their lives.

"Prison does not give anyone a sense of responsibility. It's the exact opposite," she said. "You see a cell in the prison system and it's disgusting, but it's not necessarily the hardest punishment for a person coming from a world these people have come from."

"Our punishment is much worse. It's that you work."

DISINCENTIVES TO EMPLOYMENT

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, job layoffs, illness, the death of a wage earner, the closing of a plant, the failure of a crop are some of the factors that can trigger a family's becoming poor; all are events beyond the control of an individual. We need to be sure we are there to help that person or that family to be able to help themselves as soon as possible. We cannot do that when we are actually providing disincentives to work.

The Grand Forks Committee on Human Needs recently addressed the disincentive our current AFDC and Food Stamp system imposes on parents who want to work but have dependent children and no one to take care of the children.

Attached is the report of the Mayor's Committee on Human Needs. This information should help us when we formulate policy on how to provide incentives to people to move from the welfare roles to the payrolls.

April 8, 1986.

Representative BYRON DORGAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DORGAN: We are a group of concerned citizens who serve on the Grand Forks Mayor's Committee on Human Needs. The major goal of this committee is to address the concerns of the poor and disadvantaged groups in our city. A concern with which the committee has been struggling is the disincentives to employment for parents receiving Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC) benefits. As you know, AFDC is an extremely complex federal/state program and substantive changes in this program must occur at a Federal level. We believe some fundamental changes in the AFDC program should occur in order to create an incentive to employment for AFDC recipients. Therefore, we are asking that you share our concerns and examine means to reward, rather than frustrate, efforts of these parents to find and keep employment.

To illustrate this point, we share the following realistic example in which a parent

can in fact find herself with fewer resources because she has chosen to work in an effort to become less dependent upon public aid.

It is not uncommon in North Dakota to find a 20-year-old woman who is single, has a three-year-old child, and receives AFDC benefits in the amount of \$301.00 a month and \$125.00 a month in food stamps. This is the maximum amount of AFDC and food stamp benefits an individual can receive in North Dakota for a two person household with no other source of income. Typically, this woman's only employment opportunities are less than full-time employment at minimum rate. If she works 30 hours per week for a minimum wage of \$3.35 per hour, her gross income is \$432.15 per month. This income will affect her and her child's AFDC and food stamp benefits substantially, as can be seen on the attached chart. The working mother made \$36.15 for the first four months. The next eight months actually cost her \$12.85 per month to work. After one year, it cost her \$32.85 per month to work.

It is also noteworthy to remember that full-time employment would exacerbate this problem even more for this woman.

This situation is not atypical. We solicit your support in alleviating the problem of disincentives to employment for AFDC parents. We sincerely hope you will involve yourself in what we perceive to be a meaningful reform of the welfare system.

We feel that there must be a better design to the system towards the goal of assisting and encouraging AFDC recipients who want to work with more generous transitional incentives which will save taxpayers money in the long run.

We would be interested in your feelings about the matter of incentives/disincentives for AFDC parents wanting to work. We would also be interested in knowing if you are aware of any efforts within Congress, the Department of Health and Human Services, or the Administration to deal with this problem. We would be happy to meet with you or your staff at some mutually convenient time to explore the situation further.

Thank you very much for your consideration and assistance.

Sincerely,

ELIOT GLASSHEIM,

Major's Committee on Human Needs.

Eliot Glassheim, Chairman, Quad County Community Action Agency; Rosie Black, Vice Chair, Citizen Representative; Renee Moon, Secretary, Grand Forks Public School, Special Services; David Braaten, Grand Forks County Social Services; Tim Heisler, North Dakota Job Service; Robert Sanderson, Northeast Human Service Center.

Ron Volden, United Way; Bob Gustafson, Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce; Dennis Johnson, Grand Forks City Council; Margaret Olmstead, Grand Forks Public Health Department; Judy Miezwa, Adult Abuse Community Service; Herb Schimmelpennig, Vocational Rehabilitation; Rita Brown, Senior Citizen Representative; Thomasine Heitkamp, UND Social Work Department; Ernest Norman, UND Social Work Department; James Lason, UND Sociology Department; Ed Waldron, UND Medical School; Earl Beal, Citizen Representative; John O'Leary, Grand Forks Office of Urban Development; Ruth Jones Project Self-Sufficiency.

SYSTEMIC DISINCENTIVES AGAINST WORKING

	Household A—non-working AFDC recipient	Household B—Single mother w/3-year-old child, who goes to work 30 hr. per week at \$3.35 an hour (months after starting work)	1-4	5-12	12+
Gross work earnings.....			\$432.15	\$432.15	\$432.15
(+) Total AFDC grant.....	\$301		162.00	93.00	64.00
(+) Total food stamps.....	125		63.00	83.00	92.00
Total gross income.....	426		657.15	608.15	588.15
(-) Baby sitting cost.....		(120.00)		(120.00)	(120.00)
(-) Work-associated costs.....		(75.00)		(75.00)	(75.00)
Actual disposal income.....	426		462.15	413.15	393.15
Net gain(loss) from working.....		36.15		(12.85)	(32.85)
Gain(loss) per hour.....		0.28		(0.10)	(0.25)

The chart above compares disposable income for two households: Household A is a single mother who has a 3-year old child and who does not work; Household B is exactly the same, except that the mother attempts to take care of herself by working. Our assumption, based on experience, is that the woman in Household B does not have much training, is not sought after in the labor market, and will have to start as a 30 hour/week worker at minimum wage.

Under the present system, there is some attempt to build work incentives into the system. That is, a work allowance and a child care allowance are subtracted from earnings in computing AFDC benefits. An additional \$30 a month in earnings are disregarded for the first four months and an additional one-third of the net earnings (after work allowance, child care and \$30 disregard) are also not counted as earnings for the first year after starting work.

Though these disregards are an acknowledgment that the system must provide incentives if we wish to encourage AFDC recipients to work, the results do not accomplish the intention. The woman who does not choose to work has \$426 of disposable income from AFDC and food stamps. After deducting actual out of pocket expenses attributable to working (baby sitting, clothing and transportation expenses, Social Security deduction), the woman who chooses to work has a net disposable income gain of 28 cents an hour for the first four months she works, and a net disposable income loss from working of 10 cents an hour for the rest of the first year.

The disincentives to working get worse if one adds in other complicating factors such as Medical Assistance, Housing Allowances and Fuel Assistance. We are not arguing against the minimal support systems for single mothers who cannot or do not want to work. What we are saying is that the social support system must not be so quickly withdrawn from those single parents who wish to work themselves out of dependency towards self-sufficiency. We hope that Congress will work with the appropriate agencies to correct this disincentive problem. We would be glad to be involved in any proposed solutions that would replace disincentives for working with incentives to work.

A PROFILE IN HUMANITY

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, Mitchell Y. Watanabe is a young man who has shared with

me some thoughts he has written about his grandfather, Harry Watanabe. The elder Mr. Watanabe was one of the 120,000 loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry interned by this Government during World War II.

The story of Mr. Watanabe's life is one that brings to life the human tragedy of the internment; and of the spirit and endurance that enabled Americans of Japanese ancestry to rebuild their lives.

I am sure my colleagues will find this brief remembrance moving and interesting.

A PROFILE IN HUMILITY—MITCHELL Y. WATANABE

This is an article about perhaps that least admired of human virtues—humility. St. Paul described humility as 'Not to think more highly of oneself than he ought to think'. And this is a story of the pressures experienced by a turn of the century immigrant and the grace with which he endowed them—an account of the loss of his occupations, the relocation of his being and the vindication of his reputation and principles.

A nation which has forgotten the quality of humility which in the past was brought into the public spotlight is not likely to insist upon or require that quality in its general public today—and in fact we may have forgotten. We may remember the hardships endured by our immediate forefathers when they first immigrated to America, or were forced onto reservations, but we have forgotten their convictions of providing a better way of life for their children. We have forgotten and possibly we do not care.

Recently, I watched my shocked father view the culmination of his work of thirty years as a pharmacist lay in ruins, as his store was demolished by an earthquake. This he did too stunned to cry with the full knowledge that he had no specific insurance coverage for this type of disaster. Reflecting on this, I wondered if that was the way my grandfather had appeared when he first inspected his first field of cantaloupes in America glistening in the sun with a disease, completely ruined. He had saved enough money to farm by making beds for a hotel and filling capsules for a pharmacy. Those things he did for less than ten cents an hour.

Set back by farming, my grandfather began working toward beginning a plant nursery. This he did in Coalinga, California, an area with poor soil, a harsh climate, and worst of all at the time, alkaline 'hard' water. However the seedlings he planted flourished and he reportedly became quickly established as the leading authority on gardening for the community. Yet still, the holiday dinners were mostly celebrated when a loving neighbor would give the family a turkey. Consequently, he again attempted to farm. This time he met the same fate when his fruit orchard crop failed.

Returning to gardening in the same town, he greatly benefited from Roosevelt's depression measures. He did this by designing the landscape for the accelerated construction of public buildings, and providing the hardest plants. However, just when the nursery business began doing well along with the assistance of this two eldest sons, he was told to relocate by a Presidential order. This he did without remark. Afterwards, he returned once more to begin the Nursery. Coalinga was his home where his character was recognized better than his Japanese features.

With his words, my grandfather only instructed me to do what ever I did to the best

of my ability, and above all else to be honest. By his actions and through the absence of words concerning his difficult past, he demonstrated humility. O.K., so his crop failed; who was he to be immune from natural disaster. O.K., so the country he chose to live in ordered him into a camp; of what benefit would it be for his children and their children to protest this occurrence and thus kinder more prejudice. Because he felt this way he left his home without arrogance although it meant placing himself in a position inferior to his fellow Americans. In the Japanese culture this meant not being fit for society. Furthermore, he had completely abstained from any anger, bitterness, or remorse concerning the past as it could interfere with the contentment of the present and future.

A biblical proverb states that 'before honor comes humility'. A local newspaper article proclaimed that 'at one time Harry Watanabe was just about the best known man in Coalinga'. I was taught in fifth grade that the city council had moved to allow my grandfather and his family to stay in town during World War II. Throughout my life people from the community have spontaneously told me warm stories and praises of my grandparents. However, my grandfather has always been the proudest of raising three children that have never spent a day in jail and have gone on to be contributing members of their community.

To most Americans, at least a part of this story has been heard countless times from their forefathers. However, to the people with the 'me' or 'us first' attitude, the moral of this story does not seem to have been grasped. In fact, the meaning of humility is frequently misunderstood. Some may despise the dullness of its presentation, but may also fail to note the implications of its consequences. Some may admire its virtues in other people and for other times, but may fail to comprehend its current potentialities.

The quality of humility allows one to step back from an issue and view it and its possible results objectively from both sides. Furthermore, it permits one to consult another source regardless of rank. These few consequences alone leave one in a better position to make a more honorable decision.

The 'me first' attitude, which is nothing new but perhaps now more celebrated, seems to be an attempt to achieve success through a short cut. I can understand the reasoning behind this. By looking out for number one, you won't be helping someone else get ahead. However, I am convinced that success is being able to reflect on your past with satisfaction, which is shared or upheld by your peers. This is what my grandfather has achieved through humility—not through putting his self-esteem or his profit first.

As you have probably recognized, this article has used the structure of John F. Kennedy's *Profiles In Courage*, at times only altering a few words of a sentence. (My sincerest apology to anyone I have offended.) However, this does not mean humility is opposed to courage. The antonym for courage is cowardice, which is not depicted in this story. To persevere through decisions which separate one from family, friends, and country takes much courage. Also, this article is not intended to encourage dependence, agreement to all compromise, or excessively withdrawn or stubborn adherence to ones own personal convictions.

The intension of this article is to encourage present and future generations to perse-

vere in the pursuit of their American dream, raising above external circumstances and mediocrity. In particular, this story is to bestow more honor on the early Japanese immigrants. A document to inspire my present "me" generation to provide hope for future children. My immediate forefathers have accomplished this for me by living honorable lives. We should acknowledge this in all peoples to provide restitution for the difficult times they have endured because of their humility. If we do not, we will rob our elders of the satisfaction with their lives and future generations of some hope.

To conclude, I will basically replace the word courage with humility in the final paragraph of *Profiles In Courage*. To be humble, this story makes clear, requires no exceptional qualifications, no magic formula, no special combination of time, place, and circumstance. It is an opportunity that sooner or later is presented to us all. In whatever arena of life one may meet the challenge of humility, whatever may be the sacrifices one faces if one follows their conscience—the loss of their friends, their fortune, their contentment, even the esteem of their fellow man—each person must decide for their self the course they will follow. This story of past humility can define that ingredient—it can teach, it can offer hope, it can provide inspiration. But it cannot supply humility itself. For this each person must look into his own soul.

PROGRESS ON CLEAN COAL DEMONSTRATIONS

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 21, 1986, the Department of Energy made public a list of approximately 50 companies who have submitted proposals to be considered for the clean coal technology fund. This latest disclosure brings us one step closer to attaining the goal of the widespread demonstration of the use of coal in an environmentally sound manner. It has been a long and difficult congressional task to obtain the set-aside for the clean coal technology reserve fund and those of us who have been ardent supporters of it may soon see the fruits of our labors. I am particularly pleased with the progress since the clean coal bills I introduced first contained the main features of the provisions which were ultimately contained in the enacting legislation.

When Congress authorized the Clean Coal Technology Program in 1985, and appropriated the first \$400 million for the fund, we realized that there existed a clear Federal need to encourage a focused effort to obtain acceptance in the marketplace through accelerated clean coal technology demonstrations. This program will enable us to utilize our vast coal resources in the most beneficial manner and may also help to revitalize our U.S. coal industry. I still believe that both of these goals can be accomplished and that the degree of interest shown in this program as well as the quality of the proposals is a heartening indication that our hopes for this program were well-founded. It is clear from the wide range of companies involved and technologies sug-

gested in the proposals that this program is of great interest to the most solid technical performers in the fossil energy community and thus of great importance to our secure energy future.

I have attached the list of proposals as they appeared in the *Energy Daily*.

Elgin-Butler Brick Co., Austin, Texas. Project not specified in public documents.

State of Minnesota, U.S. Steel Corp. and Korf Engineering. Seeking \$59 million to demonstrate a process called COREX direct-smelting, which would use coal in a replacement for conventional blast furnaces.

Babcock & Wilcox Co. and Ohio Edison Co. To demonstrate an advanced limestone injection process called Coolside to control sulfur dioxide emissions in coal-fired plants.

American Electric Power Service Corp. Seeking cost sharing to demonstrate pressurized fluidized bed combustion at Ohio Power Co.'s 70 megawatt Tidd plant in Brilliant, Ohio.

Pennsylvania Coke Technology Inc., ENI Engineering Co., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Consolidation Coal Co. and Kaiser Engineers. A \$53 million, 45-month project to build a PACTI plant that produces coke for steelmaking and electricity as a byproduct.

Consolidation Coal Co. and Foster Wheeler Power Systems Corp. For an advanced integrated gasification combined cycle plant in Morgantown, W.Va.

American Minerals Inc. of Oswego, Kansas. A proposal to demonstrate reclamation of abandoned coal slurry ponds.

City of Tallahassee, Combustion Engineering, Bechtel North American Power Corp., R.W. Beck and Associates and Westinghouse Electric Corp. Requesting \$50 million to convert a gas/oil fired plant into a 235 megawatt circulating atmospheric fluidized bed power plant.

University of Cincinnati. For a proprietary swirling circulating fluidized bed boiler producing 100,000 pounds per hour of steam to be installed on the university's east campus.

Wisconsin Electric Power Co., Gilbert/Commonwealth, BBC Brown Boveri Inc., Foster Wheeler, Research-Cottrell and the Electric Power Research Institute. Seeking \$60 million for a turbocharged PFBC retrofit of the utility's 80 megawatt Port Washington unit 2 plant.

Energotechnology Corp., Duke Power Co. and the North Carolina Alternative Energy Corp. A \$21.4 million project that integrates a pulverized coal boiler, a smaller fluidized bed boiler and a simple coal cleaning plant.

Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., Montrose, Colo. For its \$87 million conversion of a coal-fired plant at the Nucla Station, where construction is already in progress.

North Marion Development, Inc./MADIFCO, Fairmont, W.Va. A project that will recover coal from refuse piles and lagoons.

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. Seeking support for a compressed air storage powerplant with a coal-fired fluidized bed combustor as a heat source.

Charwill Corp., Boren, Calif. Project not specified in public documents.

Dow Corning Corp., Midland, Mich. A project to collect and use waste gas produced in submerged-arc electric furnaces during reduction of silica ores with coal to produce high-silicon ferroalloys.

NOXSO Corp., Library, Pa. A demonstration of the NOXSO process at Ohio Edison's Toronto plant in Toronto, Ohio.

Stirling Energies, Inc., Beckley, W.Va. For upgraded coal washing facilities.

M.W. Kellogg Co., Houston, Texas. For an integrated gasification combined cycle plant in Somerset County, Pa., using the KRW fluidized bed gasifier.

Energy International, Inc., Cheswick, Pa. For an underground coal gasification facility in Wyoming to produce 4,000 barrels per day of liquids and 60 million cubic feet per day of substitute natural gas.

Combustion Engineering, Windsor, Conn. To demonstrate advanced coal cleaning technologies.

Weirton Steel Corp., Weirton, W.Va. To demonstrate the KohleReduktion process of direct reduction iron making.

University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla. For a smallscale project to test coal water slurries with natural gas assist in a 20,000 pound per hour watertube oil boiler.

Western Energy Co., Butte, Mont. For an advanced coal cleaning process to upgrade low-rank western coals to the equivalent of low-sulfur, high-Btu eastern bituminous.

Ohio Ontario Clean Fuels Inc., Stearns Catalytic Corp. and HRI Inc. For a project to convert high sulfur Ohio coal to liquids using HRI and Stearns Catalytic experience with coal/oil co-processing.

TRW Inc., Redondo Beach, Calif. Project not specified in public documents.

Community Central Energy Corp., Scranton, Pa. A project to evaluate several unspecified pre-combustion coal cleaning technologies.

United Coal Co., Bristol, Va. Project not specified in public documents.

Dravo Wellman Co. and Battelle Columbus Laboratories. For a \$60 million demonstration of a proprietary technology for agglomerating high sulfur coal and lime in a gasifier to yield a low sulfur, high heating value fuel.

Sanitech Inc., City of Hamilton, Ohio, and Lorain County Community College. To build two different Sanitech traveling grate coal gasifiers, one producing gas for a conventional electric boiler, the other to heat the community college campus.

Atlantic Research Corp., Alexandria, Va. For a project to demonstrate coal cleaning with bacteria at one ton per hour.

Energy and Environmental Research Corp., Irvine, Calif. For a project to apply gas reburning-sorbent injection to a large coal-fired utility boiler.

University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. To build a 200,000 pound per hour atmospheric fluidized bed boiler to heat the university campus.

Coal Technology Corp., Naples, Fla. For a coal mine refuse project.

ZTEK Corp., Waltham, Mass. For a project coupling high temperature solid oxide (zirconia) fuel cells to a coal gasifier.

Coal Tech Corp., Merion, Pa. For a test of an advanced, air-cooled cyclone coal combustor on a 23 million Btu/hour oil-designed package boiler in Williamsport, Pa.

Southwestern Public Service Co., Amarillo, Texas. To replace an 18-year-old gas-fired plant with a 250 megawatt circulating bed boiler, with DOE picking up \$43 million of the \$114 million total.

Recovery Systems, Ltd., Oakbrook, Ill. For a 100-megawatt demonstration of the Pircon-Peck process of using phosphate rock and ammonia to capture flue gas pollutants, with a fertilizer by-product.

PPG Industries, Inc., Lake Charles, La. For a demonstration of a 375 kilowatt fuel cell, with fuel from gasified coal.

McDonnell Douglas Energy Systems, Inc. Louisville, Ky. For development of an advanced coal cleaning plant using microbubble column flotation.

Westinghouse Electric Corp., Madison, Pa. To combine coal gasification with the KRW gasifier and the Westinghouse air-cooled phosphoric acid fuel cell, a \$36 million project with DOE picking up 36 percent of the funding.

ChemCoal Associates, Cleveland, Ohio. For a project using coal solvents and alkali to dissolve and breakdown coal, yielding solid and distillate fuels.

Tennessee Valley Authority. To install a full-scale dry scrubber on the 160 megawatt unit 8 at the Shawnee power plant near Paducah, Ky.

Tennessee Valley Authority, National Fertilizer Development Center, Air Products and Chemicals Inc., Chem Systems Inc. and the Electric Power Research Institute. To demonstrate the once-through methanol process as an enhancement to integrated combined cycle power generation from coal.

General Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio. To demonstrate the feasibility of a simplified integrated gasification combined cycle system at five and 50 megawatts.

FMC Corp., Schaumburg, Ill. Project not specified in public documents.

Questar Synfuels Corp., Salt Lake City, Utah. To upgrade an existing coal gasification unit at West Jordan, Utah, to process 30 tons per day.

The National Lime Association, Arlington, Va. Project not specified in public documents.

Chemion Corp., Henderson, Nev. Project not specified in public documents.

FALMOUTH, MA: 300 YEARS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker—

Whereas, In the year One Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty, Jonathan Hatch and Isaac Robinson did build their dwellings on "the Neck of land beside the Herring Broke," in the place known to the Indians as Suckanesset, on the narrow land, now called Cape Cod, this land having been purchased from the Indians with the permission of the Court of Plymouth Colony; and

Whereas, Hatch and Robinson were joined by other settlers who with them tilled the land and founded Suckanesset Plantation; and

Whereas, This settlement did grow and prosper, and in the year One Thousand Six Hundred and Eighty Six, on the day which modern reckoning would be the fifteenth day of June, was granted Charter as the Town of Suckanesset; and

Whereas, Several years later said Town of Suckanesset, to honor the English explorer Bartholomew Gosnold, did change its name to Falmouth, this being the anchorage at the mouth of the river Fal in England from which Gosnold sailed in the year One Thousand Six Hundred and Two on his voyage of exploration, in the course of which he explored the coast of New England and, according to tradition, set foot on the shore of Suckanesset; and

Whereas, The people of Falmouth, Massachusetts, did valiantly and effectively defend their shores against the enemies of the United States in the War of Independence and the War of 1812;

Whereas, The Town of Falmouth did, in the course of time, become a favorite summer resort, a beloved retirement haven and the home of world renowned scientific institutions devoted to the study of the oceans and the creatures that dwell therein,

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join with me in saluting the Town of Falmouth as it celebrates its Tricentennial on Sunday, the Fifteenth Day of June in the Year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighty Six.

THE TAXPAYERS CANNOT AFFORD AN UNTESTED AMRAAM

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I inserted for the record a memorandum written by Secretary Weinberger's own test director, Jack Krings, concerning the test results for AMRAAM [advanced medium range air-to-air missile]. Mr. Krings memo stated that there was not enough test information to certify the AMRAAM's performance.

Now I have learned that the Development Test and Evaluation office also seriously questioned the performance of the AMRAAM. I have enclosed that memorandum along with my latest correspondences with the Defense Department for my colleagues information.

I am not calling for the cancellation of the AMRAAM. However, I believe that during this time of budget constraint, we should seriously consider whether millions of dollars should be spent to qualify a second producer for a weapon whose performance is very uncertain at this time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, May 7, 1986.

Hon. CASPAR WEINBERGER,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter responding to my questions concerning the AMRAAM program.

I appreciate the clarification of your February 28, 1986 certification that the AMRAAM met the requirements laid out by Congress in Public Law 99-145, Section 10.

However, several points in your letter disturb me. In regards to the December 17, 1985 memorandum written by the Director of Operational Testing you state "the memorandum did not suggest that I not make the required certification to Congress."

I agree with you that the OT&E memorandum did not state directly that you shouldn't certify the AMRAAM's performance. Nonetheless, I'm sure if you reread the memorandum you'll agree that such statements as "There is a low probability of adequate test results being available for an operational capability forecast before March certification" leaves little uncertainty as to the intended message.

Moreover, I was just as chagrined to learn that not only did the OT&E office question the certification of the AMRAAM's per-

formance, but that your own Development Test and Evaluation office also seriously questioned the performance of the AMRAAM. (see attached)

Let me add that there is no ambiguity in DT&E's viewpoint: "We can not recommend that AMRAAM be certified as being expected to meet all its performance requirements on the basis of the limited FSD (full scale development) testing done to date."

Your point is well taken that the performance certification was to be based on information that would be available by March 1st under the revised DSARC testing schedule. However, the AMRAAM did not even meet the revised testing schedule. The revised testing schedule called for 6 DT&E tests to be completed by March 1st. Only 3 tests were conducted by March 1st due to various problems with the missile. According to Hughes, along with the 3 successful launches there were eight launch failures. Two of these failures occurred after the three successful launches (see attached). As the DT&E report states, "the revised flight test schedule is not being met."

As a former Air Force pilot myself, I appreciate the Air Force's desire to get this missile going and keep it on track. I want to do everything possible to help our pilots, but there is a presumption in the Pentagon that the AMRAAM will come on board come hell or highwater—or taxpayer dollars. This is clearly shown in the decision to set up a coproducer—despite the fact that both test offices have grave concerns about the missile's performance to date. Somewhere it is lost that the goal of defense procurement is to give our fightingmen weapons that work—not to see how many new weapons can be brought on line.

As I've said before, I am not calling for the cancellation of the AMRAAM. I firmly believe an upgrade of the Sparrow missile is needed. In addition, I visited Eglin AFB and was thoroughly impressed with the quality and conviction of the men in charge of the AMRAAM program. Nevertheless, until the design is finished and full operational testing has been completed, I don't know—and the Pentagon shouldn't presume—that AMRAAM is the answer to all our problems.

Therefore, I strongly urge you to cancel production funds for the second source, Raytheon. These funds could be better utilized in speeding up development and testing of the AMRAAM, and increasing the number of operational tests.

I look forward to working with you further in this matter.

Best regards,

DENNY SMITH,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, February 21, 1986.

Memorandum for Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Air Warfare).

Subject: AMRAAM certification.

Your memo of 14 Feb requested comments on the USAF's proposed letter to Congress for SECDEF signature relative to certification of the AMRAAM PROGRAM. There were five concerns contained in Congressional language, three of which are pertinent for DTE comment. Our comments are summarized as follows and discussed in detail on the attached.

We believe that the Secretary can certify that AMRAAM's design is complete with regard only to the design as we know it today, on paper, and that AMRAAM's performance to date has been nominal indicat-

ing at least a slow but positive trend toward meeting all its performance requirements. We can not recommend that AMRAAM be certified as being expected to meet all its performance requirements on the basis of the limited FSD testing done to date.] [Further, the Secretary can certify that it is our intent to ensure that testing will be conducted on any and all producibility changes incorporated into AMRAAM as a follow-on test after FSD and prior to incorporating such changes into production missiles.] Beyond this any statements as to certification should contain appropriate caveats as further delineated in the attached backup discussion.

JOSEPH A. NAVARRO,
Deputy Under Secretary,
Test and Evaluation.

Attachment.

AMRAAM CERTIFICATION

a. Congress.—Is the AMRAAM design complete and are you confident the present design will work?

Discussion. To the extent that the FSD critical design review has been completed we can say that the design for AMRAAM is complete. However, to date, the manufacturer, Hughes has experienced considerable difficulty in delivering flight test missiles due to the complexity of the design which has contributed to the delay in manufacturing FSD missiles that can be certified as ready for acceptance and test by the government. This necessitated USAF's restructuring of the FSD schedule in the fall of 1985 after 44 months into a 50 month FSD program in which Hughes should have delivered 87 of 91 total flight test missiles but were only able to deliver 6. The new restructured schedule requires the contractor to deliver the original total quantity of missiles on a semiannual basis rather than monthly. Thus he is allowed contractually to deliver a given increment of missiles on the last day of the semiannual period of need be. To date Hughes has delivered 18 missiles against a revised requirement of 16 total in 1985 and 21 in the first half of 1986. The revised flight firing schedule presented at the 16 August 1986 DSARC Program Review specified that 6 flight firings were to occur by the current date. However, only 3 flight test missiles have been fired to date all of which were considered successful notwithstanding the fact that significant delays were encountered in achieving launch due in part to quality assurance anomalies encountered in manufacturing. A fourth attempt to fire an AMRAAM test missile in late January resulted in a hang-fire/no-test when a malfunction occurred in the missile's electrical power supply causing the missile to fail BIT in the final fractional second between the pilot squeezing the trigger initiating the firing sequence and the missile's rocket motor achieving ignition. This failure is still under review by Hughes and the JSPO and has prompted postponement of scheduled flight firings until sometime in March. Thus the revised flight test schedule is not being met. Assuming, however, the current delay is not prolonged, due to manufacturing difficulties or as yet unknown design problems, the revised flight test program can be resumed on schedule without significant effort or impact on FSD.

The point to be made here is that although we can certify the design is complete as we knew it at the conclusion of the critical design review preceding commencement of missile build up for FSD, design

issues will surely surface as apparently they have already with the limited number of firings that have occurred. There is nothing new here for such is to be expected at this stage in development of AMRAAM or any other weapon system.

As an example, the seeker RF transmitter has been redesigned from a solid state system to a Traveling Wave Tube Amplifier. The need for this design change first came to light during the validation phase when it was learned that the solid state seeker technology was not as mature as originally thought. Unlike the solid state transmitter system, the power output of the TWTA could meet average and peak power requirements, however, output of the TWTA has been scaled down temporarily in FSD in order to continue flight testing and avoid a problem with self jamming of the receiver while an engineering solution to this problem is intended to demonstrate effectiveness against self screening of the targets or ECM generated by a SOJ.

Therefore certification of design is contingent upon the realization that design changes will likely occur as a result of development and operational tests and it is not possible to predict the magnitude of these changes or how they might affect performance. Of course, all of this is independent of the design changes that are already under consideration for producibility enhancement.

b. Congress.—Do you believe performance will not be degraded from the original development specification as modified by the 14 June 85 DCP, i.e., do you believe performance will meet expectations?

Discussion. The Validation Phase (Advanced Development) demonstrated the proof of concept of AMRAAM through a medium of guided test vehicles, captive test vehicles, simulations and subsystem ground tests. FSD flight firings from the F-15 and the F-16 have indicated nominal missile flight performance once rocket motor ignition and rail launch have been achieved. These missile shots have progressed from the least demanding technically to profiles with ever increasing difficulty and in so doing have successfully demonstrated target acquisition and track capability in a clutter environment and all three modes of missile guidance (command, inertial, active) against single non-maneuvering targets in a benign ECM environment. Based on these limited tests it is difficult to say with a high degree of certainty that AMRAAM can be expected to meet its requirements as specified in the development specification and modified by the latest version of the DCP (dated Nov. 85). We can say, however, with confidence, that the trend so far in meeting performance requirements, albeit slow, is at least positive. Predictions of performance compliance based on computer simulation, captive carriage and performance qualification tests of subassemblies can only be viewed as preliminary.

c. Congress.—Can we be assured that producibility changes will work before the production line is changed?

Discussion. The blue ribbon AMRAAM committee composed of members from OSD, USAF/USN with Hughes engineering serving as consultants, recommended cost reducing producibility changes for AMRAAM some of which have been undertaken by the USAF for incorporation into AMRAAM beginning with LOT 3 production missiles. There is evidence that a general plan exists to test producibility enhanced AMRAAM missiles, however details await

further design definition. The point here is that the USAF does intend to test producibility design changes as they are developed and incorporated into follow-on test missiles to ensure performance requirements are met prior to making changes to baseline production. Annex E of the current DCP reflects this intent.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, April 17, 1986.

Hon. DENNY SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am responding to your March 20 letter regarding the AMRAAM program. I understand several offices in the Department of Defense also have received letters from you recently on this program, and I believe that you have some misunderstandings about AMRAAM that are leading to incorrect conclusions.

In your letter you questioned my certifying AMRAAM performance without complete testing information. As you know, Public Law 99-145, Section 210 required that I certify to five design, performance, test, and cost areas by March 1, 1986. This arbitrary date selected by the Congress did not relate specifically to any program milestone. At the time the law was drafted, the Congress knew that the AMRAAM full-scale development program had been restructured and extended from 50 to 79 months and that "complete test information" could not possibly be available by March 1986. This indicates to me that we were to address the certification areas based upon the information available by March 1986.

The law calls for a certification that "performance has not been degraded from the original development specification . . . as amended by the draft Development Concept Paper (DCP) of June 14, 1985." This rather clearly implies that I was to compare performance expected at the time the specification was written to the performance expected at the time of the certification. There was a wealth of data available from ground and flight testing that led me to certify to this particular requirement. Since my last letter to you, the General Accounting Office has testified that there was no legal basis for objecting to the certification.

You have focused on the memorandum written to me by my Director of Operational Testing as a basis for questioning my certification. While we have concerns about whether the test program will be able to keep the pace necessary for us to make future production decisions in accordance with the current schedule, the memorandum did not suggest that I not make the required certification to Congress. My certification is altogether separate from a decision to enter production; each production decision will be based on an assessment of program progress against preestablished decision criteria.

I believe that we have a well thought out program and have established the proper high level oversight. My entire staff concurred with the certification as I sent it to Congress, and I continue to stand behind my position that the certification is appropriate.

Sincerely,

CAP WEINBERGER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, 20515 March 20, 1986.
Hon. Caspar Weinberger,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your reply to my letter concerning the certification of the cost and performance of the AMRAAM.

In light of the memorandum that the Director of Operational Testing wrote to you on December 17th about the inadequacy of complete testing information, I find it all the more incomprehensible that you certified the AMRAAM's performance.

Mr. Secretary, to put it bluntly, I'm outraged that you would certify the performance of a weapon which has not been thoroughly tested. As you know, until the completion of thorough testing, there can be little confidence as to the final design and cost per missile.

I hope you will seriously reconsider your certification and ask the Congress for an extension of the certification deadline—so you can complete testing of the AMRAAM. I will be happy to help you in this effort.

Best regards,

DENNY SMITH.

WELCOME, ANATOLY
SHCHARANSKY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 13, I was pleased and honored to join my colleagues in welcoming Anatoly Shcharansky to the Capitol of the United States.

The triumph of Anatoly Shcharansky over the forces of repression is as genuine an example of courage and commitment to cherished values as the world is likely to witness. His was a victory for human rights in a state that chooses to devote a sizable part of its bureaucratic machinery to placing every possible roadblock in the path of the free exercise of those rights.

The Shcharanskys' names have become synonymous with unwavering dedication to human rights. By enduring 8 long years of being harassed, interrogated, threatened, and separated, they have demonstrated the kind of strength and spirit of which heroes are made. Each day they were tested, each day they fought to be free, and they have prevailed.

We all share in the joy of Mr. Shcharansky's release from prison. That joy is felt not only in these Halls, but in communities throughout the Nation. Last Friday was Shcharansky Day in my hometown of Springfield, MA. The Springfield Jewish Federation organized a very meaningful ceremony of tribute and thanksgiving for the triumph of the Shcharanskys, and I am sure that similar events have taken place in many other American cities and towns. However, at this time of celebration, we must not lose sight of the fact that thousands of Jews continue to be denied the right to emigrate from a country which punishes them for their religious beliefs and belittles their values. This treatment by Soviet authorities makes a mockery of their supposed adherence to the principles of the Helsinki Accords and the Uni-

versal Declaration of Human Rights. As Americans, we must continue to call attention to the treatment of Soviet refuseniks. For it is our vocal concern that provides them with the encouragement, and the confirmation of the justice of their cause, and which helps them to go on.

Mr. Speaker, the Shcharanskys have reminded the world of two great truths: That the yearning for basic human rights is universal, and that to keep silent in the face of repression is to guarantee its perpetuation. I hope that their presence in our citadel of liberty will cause us to redouble our national and individual efforts to extend the precious gift of freedom to all those who seek it.

DEUKMEJIAN REMEMBERS
ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to underscore my support for the statements of the Governor of my great State of California regarding the significance of the Armenian Martyr's Day Ceremony. On April 24, Gov. George Deukmejian remembered one of the great tragedies of this century, the Armenian Genocide. Today many Armenians continue to carry a burdensome memory of gross injustices during the World War I era perpetrated against them, including the Deukmejian family by the Turkish under the Ottoman Empire.

It think that the Governor's statements constitute a healthy catharsis of past injustices which history cannot hide. As a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 192, which designates April 24 as a day of remembrance of man's inhumanity to man, I, too, feel very strongly that we must revive the memories of past tragedies such as the Armenina Genocide precisely because properly recognizing the event is the first step in preventing a similar occurrence elsewhere in the world. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I submit Governor Deukmejian's well articulated comments to the RECORD.

REMARKS OF GOV. GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN

Thank you very much Ed and good evening ladies and gentlemen.

It is a great honor for me to participate in this solemn evening of remembrance and thanksgiving. I would like to thank all of you for being here to join in this tribute.

The tragedy of this century's first genocide has faded for much of the world, but not for the Armenians. For us, the memory of 1.5 million of our parents and grandparents and brothers and sisters who were massacred in their homeland 70 years ago, remains strong in our minds and heavy in our hearts.

We come together today to remember and to honor our ancestors. And we come together to thank this great nation for all the blessings we enjoy today as free people.

But we also gather to call the world's attention to the atrocities which our people suffered, and to all of the other great tragedies which people have perpetrated against people. As Armenian-Americans, we bear a

deep responsibility to help guide the world to a better path.

Good and decent people must not close their eyes to evil, must not ignore the suffering of the innocent and must never remain silent in times of moral crisis.

All societies make mistakes. Great societies own up to their mistakes and vow never to repeat them. In America, we have repented for the injustice of slavery. We teach our children that it was wrong and evil, and that all people, regardless of race, color or creed, are created equal. The people of West Germany don't try to deny their culpability in World War II. They teach their children about the horrors of the Nazi Holocaust.

Yet to this day, Turkey refuses to acknowledge the historical truth of the Armenian genocide. They have not apologized or accepted moral responsibility for the actions of a previous government.

We, as survivors and children of survivors, must ensure that the immeasurable pain of the Armenian genocide is not forgotten and that its significance is not lost on this generation or any future generation. Honoring our loved ones who died is a simple act of tribute and human decency. That's why I am hurt that our own United States government will not join us in this remembrance.

The evasion and distortions of the government of Turkey have long since ceased to surprise me. It's time that the government of Turkey stopped playing its cynical game of pretense that this genocide did not occur. They know it happened. They know the evidence is there. They know that hundreds, if not thousands, of newspaper accounts appeared on the front pages of American newspapers during those years of terror.

In one of the articles, a survivor writes of the horrors he witnessed. "I saw one woman whose husband had just been killed, walking with all her clothes frozen, one child in her arms, another on her back, and the oldest walking by her side. Another woman was telling how her husband and children had been butchered before her eyes. She begged to be killed too, but instead she was subjected to treatment worse than death. The wailing of the children, the women, and old people was heartrending. Many of the refugees were swept away in trying to cross the streams, and dead bodies by the hundreds lined the road."

The murder of all the Armenian Faculty members of the Anatolia College by Turkish peasants is described in another article. "These massacres were committed at night by order of the Turkish Government," writes the President of the College, upon his return to the United States. "The pay for the peasants who committed these crimes was the privilege of stripping the clothing off their victims' bodies. One group of our college boys asked permission to sing before they died and they sang Nearer My God to Thee. Then they were struck down."

A 13-year-old Armenian girl who survived tells the tragic story of her family. "One day we came home from school early in the afternoon. We found our father at home, although it was only mid-afternoon. One of the city police was with him. The man was telling my father that he must leave his store, his home and his family, and go away to work on the roads. My mother was crying and clinging in my father's arms. You cannot go, you must not go, she kept saying over and over again. We children began to cry too. Our father turned to us and bid us still. Then he talked with our mother, telling her that she must be very brave. The of-

ficer stood impatiently waiting and said, "You must come now. Our father kissed us good-bye and went away. We never saw him again."

Ladies and gentlemen, how can anyone read these accounts and say that this genocide did not happen? When will they realize the terrible price that is paid for silence and apathy?

We're paying that price in blood today. Who does not grieve for today's tragic victims of intolerance? In one recent attack, a mother and her baby girl were blown out of an airplane window in mid-air—and the hate groups argued over who deserved the credit. Entire societies are enslaved and terrorized in places like Afghanistan, South Africa and Southeast Asia.

Today, America has vowed to stand up to these outrages, and I'm proud that our country has found the fortitude to fight for freedom and refuse to let the tyrants overrun the world. While supposed friends and allies cower in fear and make excuses for inaction, America stands tall against the abuses of human rights whether they are perpetrated by governments or by terrorists.

But there is a wide, embarrassing and inexplicable hole in that line of defense against atrocity—and that is our government's opposition to Congressional resolutions which recognize the Armenian genocide believing that support would alienate a NATO ally, Turkey.

Thankfully, other walls of resistance are tumbling down. Last August, the United Nations Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities resisted heavy Turkish pressure and recognized the 1915 massacres of Armenians as an act of genocide. This was the first time that a United Nations body has acted, and it is the result of an 11-year struggle by the Armenian community.

In February, the United States Senate approved the Genocide Convention, ending a 37 year deadlock on this issue. The passage of this measure is a clear and firm statement against all genocide. Our nation is the greatest symbol of human rights, personal freedom and economic opportunity. The Genocide Treaty puts those countries which rely on oppression, tyranny and assassination on notice that their actions will no longer be tolerated by freedom-loving people.

So tonight, I am renewing my call on the U.S. State Department to reject the pressure of the Turkish leaders and recognize the historical facts of the Armenian Genocide.

Looking around the room tonight, I see many young people—our sons and daughters and grandchildren. Perhaps some of you wonder why we come together to commemorate an event which took place so long ago. Perhaps some of you think that we are too absorbed by the heartaches of the past and should move on.

What we do here tonight is not for us, but for you. We cannot change the past. But unless we continue to speak out against the tragedy our people suffered, this cycle of horrors will go on and on.

So we remember, not only to honor our loved ones who died, but to heed the lessons of that sorrow so that we can build a safer and brighter future for all the world's children.

This is a day of sadness, but let us not overlook the rays of hope on the horizon. In so many parts of the world, differences tear communities apart. Diversity breeds hate, violence, terrorism and civil war. But here in

California, 26 million people of tremendous diversity live peacefully side-by-side. We are united by our love of freedom. And because of this, we are also bound in spirit to all those who yearn to be free. We are keepers of the flame of liberty.

I truly believe that it is within our power as residents of America's leadership state to show the world in word and deed, a better way. Through our prayers, through our actions and through the examples we set here in California, we can help bring some light and hope to even the darkest dungeons of the world. Together, we can achieve a just society of peace and security, freedom and opportunity, love and respect. That is our treasured blessing here in California. That is our simple dream for all mankind.

Thank you very much and God Bless You.

THE TRAGIC EROSION OF VA MEDICAL CARE

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Bill and Jackie Withrow of Beckley, WV, both constituents and close friends of mine, recently forwarded an article to my attention which tells the story of one veteran. The article, published in the American Legion Magazine, is a message from National Commander Dale L. Renaud to veterans and all Americans on the shortcomings of medical care provided to veterans. While the article focuses on the tragedy of one veteran, it points to the erosion of veterans benefits in general and the widespread suffering caused by this erosion.

In the best interest of veterans across the Nation, I am submitting this article for my colleagues' review. We have a commitment to provide veterans with the benefits they were promised when they sacrificed years of their lives and suffered extreme hardships to protect our national security and ideals. I urge my colleagues to read the following article and reaffirm their individual commitments to America's veterans.

HE DIED IN DEBT BECAUSE THE VA DIDN'T HAVE A BED FOR HIM

Much has been written and said about the history and purpose of Memorial Day but, this year, in addition to our traditional observance, we also must recognize a new dimension to the sacrifices of this nation's veterans.

Those we honor this Memorial Day served their country; they served her well and have received their final reward. We will decorate their graves, pay them tribute with rifle salutes, and say prayers in their memory.

But there is another group of veterans we also must remember this month and, indeed, the year round. They are the very sick, the very old, the very poor of America's veterans. They are the men and women who stood shoulder-to-shoulder with us in time of national need. Yet they continue to sacrifice for their nation by having their earned rights and benefits eroded with every turning of the page on the legislative calendar.

Is there a real threat? Is the American Legion crying "wolf"?

Hardly. Let me give you an example:

I received a letter recently from the sister-in-law of a World War II veteran. It's not necessary to name names or even say where she lives. The story speaks for itself.

Her brother-in-law was 18 when he answered America's call to arms. He served honorably in the Pacific and was awarded four bronze stars and other decorations. He even laid in a foxhole and, thinking he was dead, the enemy walked over him. He also contracted malaria.

This veteran believed his country's promise of medical care and rehabilitation by the Veterans Administration. In fact, he was treated for his ailment several times during his lifetime.

In addition to the monthly \$475 disability pay he received, he believed the VA was the only medical insurance he would ever need. Apparently he was wrong.

Late last year he became very ill. He was moved to a county hospital just a mile from his home, but he didn't have medical insurance. The staff at the hospital tried to get him a bed at a VA hospital nearby, but none was available.

Although the doctors at the county hospital did their best, seven days later he died, leaving a legacy of hospital and doctor's bills totaling \$7,700 because the VA didn't have a bed for him.

This poor, sick, elderly veteran existed on \$5,700 a year and the belief that his medical needs would be guaranteed by his wartime service to America. And the VA didn't have a bed for him.

His medical care and doctor bills for one week in a county hospital were more than he received in disability pay for a whole year. And the VA didn't have a bed for him.

Are we crying "wolf" when we say veterans' rights and benefits are at stake? Hardly; and I have had it.

I will not stand idly by and see the most needy American veterans—the very old, the very sick, the very poor—be denied their earned benefits. I certainly don't believe my 28 million fellow veterans across this land will sit still for it either.

Most of them will never set foot in a VA hospital, but neither would one of them stand by as a needy comrade is turned away.

Let me give you an idea of what we're up against:

A 60 percent rise in the average number of veterans turned away from VA clinics—up to 37,000 per month!

An average waiting time of 29 days for new-patient appointments.

A three-fold increase in the number of outpatients discharged even though they required further medical care.

My fellow Legionnaires, there is a growing feeling of discontent in America, and it's not just among our membership. It's with all veterans.

And I believe that once our elected legislators understand that we represent a constituency of 28 million veterans and their families—Americans from every walk of society—they'll begin to listen, and listen attentively.

They were elected to reflect the views of American citizens, not to endorse the opinions of appointed bureaucrats, and here's one citizen from a group of 28 million who says it definitely is *not* my desire to see my fellow veterans bear a disproportionate share of balancing the budget.

So, this Memorial Day, when we pay tribute to our fellow veterans who served, sacrificed and now have passed on, remember also that their number has been increased by one more: a very old, very sick, very poor

veteran who believed the only medical insurance he needed was that which was guaranteed by his wartime service to America.

Remind your fellow veterans of him, and enlist them in The American Legion on his behalf.

EAST ORANGE SENIOR CITIZENS LUNCHEON AND AWARDS CEREMONY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on May 9 I had the privilege to attend the mayor's Annual Senior Citizens Luncheon and Awards Ceremony for the city of East Orange. This well-attended and gala affair is held each year to recognize the contributions senior citizens make to the East Orange community.

Welcoming us to the ceremony was East Orange Mayor John C. Hatcher, Jr., who presented the awards and gave the keynote speech. Mrs. Pearl Harrison, the director of the office of public relations, served as the mistress of ceremonies. The event was organized by the division of senior citizens of the East Orange Department of Community Services. Special appearances were made by Rhoda Scott, the internationally-known jazz pianist, and Jean Cheek, a Broadway star and popular entertainer.

As Mayor Hatcher stated in his proclamation, May is the month of senior citizens. There are few better ways to commemorate this month than to honor the senior citizens who have made a difference in their communities. Twenty-nine awards were given out at the ceremony—all for outstanding leadership among the senior citizens of East Orange.

Honored as the Mother of East Orange—the Mother of the Year—was Mrs. Mary F. Wright. Mrs. Wright is 104 years old but is as independent and lively as anyone. Born in Florida in 1882, she moved to New Jersey in the 1910's and worked for years as a seamstress. Though she never had children of her own, she managed to have her own family by adopting and raising two young girls whose mother had died in 1950. She indeed deserves her new title as Mother of East Orange.

Also honored at the ceremony were: Mrs. Willie Mae Farrah, Mrs. Claudia Harold, Mr. Ernest Harrison, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Hatcher, Sr., Mr. Jack Hunter, Dr. Theodore Inge, Mrs. Geraldine Johnson, Mrs. Mittie Kornegay, Dr. Frank M. Lapeyrolerie, Mr. William Macklin.

Mrs. Delia Martin, Mrs. Betty Moshier, Mrs. Mildred Patwell, Mrs. Lucille Purdie, Mrs. Rita Roscoe, Mrs. Bridie Slevin, Mrs. Ida B. Smith, Mrs. Queenie Smith, Mr. William Smith, Mrs. Fran Wilkerson, Mrs. Carrie Williams, Mrs. Florence Henry.

Mr. Robert Ritchie, Bailey-Holt Tower Tenant Association; Mr. Gerald Alexander Brangman—Posthumously (Mrs. Ida Brangman accepting); Brookside What-Not Shop (Mrs. Marie Holmes accepting); Coppergate Senior Committee (Mrs. Catherine Selfridge accepting); Mrs. Mildred Eoff—Posthumously (Mr. Reginald Eoff accepting).

My congratulations go out to the honorees and to the organizers of this very successful event. They showed me how senior citizens remain truly young at heart.

THE NASA LEGACY; IT'S NOT ALL BAD, LET'S PRESERVE THE BEST FOR THE FUTURE

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, The *Challenger* tragedy has shocked the American public and the Congress into the realization that the most accomplished of the modern Federal bureaucracies, that is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, may be flawed. Reports abound on the errors in judgment that may have permeated our space program through the overconfidence and apparent xenophobic style of NASA management. Within the next month or so, the Rogers Commission will present its report on the Shuttle 51-L accident to the Congress and the American public. Most recently, the New York Times (April 23, 1986) published the first of two articles on alleged mismanagement and wasteful practices identified by NASA's Inspector General's Office that may have cost the space program more than \$3.5 billion. These articles identify potential contractor mismanagement activities, cost overruns, and perhaps even fraudulent expenditures, all of which contribute to casting a dark cloud over the space agency's heretofore relatively unblemished image.

However, it appears to me that as we proceed into our detailed investigations of these programs, that we should not fail to recognize the extraordinary accomplishments that our Nation's Space Program has produced over the last two decades. At this time we know orders of magnitude more about our own solar system and interplanetary space than we knew after the previous millennia of scientific inquiry into these phenomena. All of this was accomplished in the remarkably short span of less than two decades, commencing with our first entry into space in the Mercury Program, through our *Apollo* landing on the Moon and culminating recently in the revealing images returned from our *Voyager* spacecraft's tour of the outer planet Uranus. In spite of its present difficulties, the shuttle program has shown the way toward a new era for man's presence in space. No longer will we be simply passive observers of the world and the universe. The results of the very successful shuttle series of flights have shown the way to unique opportunities for mankind both from a scientific perspective as well as a commercial viewpoint. We have learned how to recover wayward satellites. We have opened up new vistas in communication and the advances in manufacturing techniques in the microgravity of space will certainly pave the way for future generations of entrepreneurs and others who can benefit from this unique environment. In my view, our world is a better place as a result of this Nation's Space Program and although we must improve and continually refine our methods and processes for exploiting this unique

horizon, we must not lose sight of the fact that the United States' Space Program has been a singular success that has put this country in an unquestionable leadership role in mankind's exploration and utilization of the space environment.

Mismanagement, waste of public funds and sloppy decisionmaking cannot be tolerated at any level of government, and it is incumbent upon us to assure that any problems which have led to abuses of Federal trust be corrected. Nevertheless, we must proceed in our efforts to assure that the NASA Program is re-established on the right track and get on with our space endeavor in a way that once again will make us all proud. Thus, I hope that both Congress and the Executive will move carefully to preserve the core capability of the agency while providing a climate for badly needed change.

COURT RULES AGAINST BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, a Federal court ruling against Blue Cross & Blue Shield has just negated the argument that the Blues should be exempt from paying Federal taxes because of their charitable activity in covering high risk individuals. The Blues serve no charitable purpose if they take premium dollars from high risk individuals and then subsequently refuse to pay for any medical expenses of these individuals.

The tax exempt status for the Blues was based on their claim that the Blues cover people that the commercial insurers refused to insure. The Blues argue that coverage of high risk individuals is an inherently charitable activity and warrants a tax exempt status.

When the tax exempt status of the Blues was considered by the House Ways and Means Committee during the tax reform considerations, the Blues were unable to demonstrate to the members that their charitable activity was substantial enough to warrant a tax exempt status.

While the Blues were petitioning Congress to keep this tax exempt status because of their coverage for high risk individuals and small groups, Loretta Washington, a local sanitation worker, was forced to haul the Blues into court just to get them to pay her hospital and doctor bills for a hysterectomy that occurred while she was insured by Blue Cross & Blue Shield of the National Capital Area.

Blue Cross & Blue Shield of the National Capital Area has the dubious distinction, as a result of this lawsuit, of being the first insurer in the District of Columbia to lose a case for bad faith due to this refusal to pay the claims of an insured.

This conduct is the antithesis of charitable activity and should be considered as Congress reviews the tax exempt status of Blue Cross & Blue Shield in the tax reform process.

The Washington Post article of May 9, 1986 follows:

PATIENT GETS \$800,000 IN INSURANCE SUIT (By Nancy Lewis)

An Alexandria woman was awarded \$800,000 yesterday by a federal court jury that found Blue Cross & Blue Shield of the National Capital Area acted in bad faith when it refused to pay \$12,000 in hospital and doctor bills.

Richard Ben Veniste, one of the attorneys for Loretta Washington, 54, said it was the first time that an individual had won a bad-faith insurance case in the District.

Washington, a sanitation inspector for the City of Alexandria, was hospitalized at Arlington Hospital in July 1981 for control of diabetes and again in August for a hysterectomy, shortly after she had changed her insurance coverage from a local health maintenance organization to Group Hospitalization Inc. and Medical Service of D.C. known as Blue Cross.

Blue Cross refused to pay the hospital and doctor bills, saying Washington had to meet a waiting period because she had the conditions when she changed coverage.

Washington notified Blue Cross that no physician had previously diagnosed the fibroid tumors that precipitated the hysterectomy, but the company said its experts found that the condition would have been present earlier.

Arlington Hospital then sued Washington for payment of her \$8,000 bill. She took a part-time job cleaning office buildings to help pay the bills, but the hospital threatened to put a lien on her house to assure payment.

Ben Veniste argued in court that Washington should not have been subject to a waiting period because she had transferred from an HMO and that federal law prohibits imposition of a waiting period in such cases.

But Blue Cross said that when Washington completed another Blue Cross enrollment card she did not fill in the portion concerning prior hospitalization coverage and that in such instances the company assumes there was none.

Ben Veniste said that the company showed bad faith by failing to make a follow-up inquiry about prior coverage, and showed that 70,000—or about half of those who enrolled with Blue Cross in 1981—failed to complete that portion of the enrollment card.

Dean Swartz, another of Washington's attorneys, said that he could not estimate how many others insured by Blue Cross might have had claims denied for similar reasons. "I just thank God for the blessing," Washington said yesterday.

Blue Cross officials could not be reached for comment.

JUVENILE ARSON

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, recently a fire investigator from Rochester, NY, sent me a letter and a copy of a report compiled by the New York State Office of Fire Prevention and Control. That investigator, Jonathon Beldue, shared with me the problem of juvenile arson, and the cost to this Nation as a result of young arsonists. I would like to share this information with my colleagues.

Arson is the fastest growing crime in this country. A disproportionately large percentage of these fires are started by juveniles. In 1984, the city of Rochester had 244,094 residents, and another 702,200 people resided in the rest of Monroe County. In that year, the Rochester Fire Department responded to approximately 10,328 incidents. Of these an amazing 40 percent of all fires set involved juveniles. A full 65 percent of these were caused by children between the ages of 5 and 9.

Jonathon Beldue saw the magnitude of this problem, and began to talk with these young offenders in an effort to determine the root causes of their actions. Jonathon started a program where he began to speak with the young offenders. In the early stages, three to four youths were called. By November of 1980, only 17 months after the program's inception, 207 juveniles had been contacted. Only two of these 207 have been "repeaters." Seizing of the success in the initial months, other agencies and associations began to get involved. The number of youths contacted to date surpass 1,500. The program continues growing; its success rate a model for all interested in juvenile arson.

Mr. Speaker, following is a copy of the letter I received from Mr. Beldue. Persons interested in obtaining a copy of the report compiled by the Fire Related Youth [FRY] Program should address their request to:

State of New York, Office of Fire Prevention and Control, 162 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12231.

CITY OF ROCHESTER,
OFFICE OF THE FIRE CHIEF,
Rochester, NY, April 9, 1986.

Congressman FRANK HORTON,
Rayburn building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: I am a Fire Investigator with the Rochester Fire Department. I have been a fire fighter for over 18 years. After being injured in a fire and building collapse in 1976, which was caused by a juvenile, I began to study juvenile fire setting.

I was assigned to the scene of a bedroom fire to talk to a suspect. During the course of the conversation with the suspect, he freely related to me how he set the fire, where under the bed he set the fire and when he did it. (While his sister was asleep on the bed.) He described his escape plan and alibi. He told of his desire for danger and thrill of danger. This was his third fire, the first being the lighting of matches and lighters, the second was setting fire to papers on the gas stove. The parents, other agencies and I worked with the juvenile. He demonstrates the progressive characteristic of the three stages of a fire setter and possible future arsonist. The juvenile was 5 years old.

Many other incidents come to mind—the child who set his brother on fire because the devil told him to, or the 12 year old female who set fire to her home because she had no bedroom door, and the child who was angry and set his cat on fire.

Annually, in the United States, millions of dollars worth of property are lost due to arson. The loss of life and personal injury to citizens and fire department personnel, combined, number in the tens of thousands. Juveniles contribute greatly to this problem. Arson is the fastest growing crime in America and a disturbingly large number of those

fires were caused by persons under 16 years old.

In July 1979 I saw a need for something to be done with juveniles experiencing fire problems. The unit was starting to receive calls from people looking for help, for their children or other juveniles that they knew had a fascination for fire. Our own investigators were finding that they were having more contacts with juvenile fire setters. In the past, the juveniles name was taken and a record kept in our office but nothing was being done to correct the problem.

After consulting with the fire chief, our program was set in motion on a part-time basis. The program started with approximately 3-4 calls a month. Between July 1979 and July 1980, I contacted approximately 47 youths with a backlog of 80 youths. At that time the program had no publicity but was growing at a high rate. By November the program had contacted 207 juveniles with only 2 repeaters. Follow-up in 4 weeks was found to be necessary on all juveniles. In December 1980 the fire chief saw a need to extend the program to full time.

More and more parents and agencies throughout the City and County were making referrals to our unit. Thus, the F.R.Y. (Fire Related Youth) program was put into full-time service with a 24 hour, 7 day a week call number. At that time, F.R.Y. was one of only 3 other fire departments in the nation set up to counsel parents and refer juveniles with fire problems but our program seemed to be more unique and was drawing more inquiries.

F.R.Y. started to get outside help, such as neighborhood associations, clinics, hospitals, etc. throughout the country so that if we could not handle the problem, the juvenile could be directed to the right agencies. Fire fighters are not psychiatrists or social workers, yet they are uniquely well suited to work with young people. Knowing what a fire fighter cannot do is as important to the success of the program as knowing what *can* be done, therefore, the referral process is critical. Being aware of the full services available is of particular importance. Personalities range from the normal child with a curiosity about fire to the seriously disturbed juveniles. Different types of intervention and treatment are required depending on the seriousness of the dysfunction. Part-time, within the first 18 months, I handled approximately 250 juveniles. To date, approximately 1,500 juveniles have passed through our F.R.Y. program. In 1983 we learned this program prevented two fires that could have been major and in one case, a life was probably saved. Of course there is no way of knowing what type of fires were prevented or how many lives saved, but we know the program is working.

The 1984 population indicated that Rochester had 244,094 residents and the County another 702,200 people. The Rochester Fire Department responded that year to approximately 10,328 incidents and found that 40% of all fires set involved youngsters. 65% of those were caused by children between 5 & 9 years old. In 1984 the F.R.Y. unit contacted 312 juveniles; 268 were males, 127 were black, 149 were white. The highest percentage were children 2 through 7 years old (134%) followed by children 8 through 12 (133%). 53% were from fatherless homes.

Firesetting problems affect all walks of life, from the sons of top executives and daughters of doctors to sons and daughters of families on welfare. The problem is the same throughout the country. Our program is now being used as a pilot program in New

York State and inquiries have come from other countries pertaining to this problem.

Approximately two years ago we needed fresh ideas so two new investigators were trained for the program. I then returned to basic fire investigation. A third man was added with the help of a state grant and I still promote this program as much as possible. Any verbal support you care to give would be appreciated.

I am enclosing a manual developed by our department and the University of Rochester. I believe this information will be interesting and informative.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN BELDUE,
Fire Investigator.

THE MEANING OF SHCHARANSKY'S STRUGGLE

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague STEPHEN SOLARZ recently gave a short, very eloquent speech on the experience of Anatoly Shcharansky and what it can teach us in our commitment to Soviet Jews. I would like to share it with my colleagues by placing it in the RECORD.

WHY WE MUST PERSEVERE FOR SOVIET JEWS (By Stephen Solarz)

Today we celebrate the freedom of Anatoly Shcharansky, a man who has returned from the gulag, where souls are crushed and bodies broken, but whose indomitable spirit enabled him to survive a horrible ordeal.

To have survived at all in the face of such cruelty . . . Dayenu . . . It would have been sufficient!

To have remained faithful to his ideals under such conditions . . . Dayenu . . . It would have been sufficient!

But to have emerged after almost 10 years, not only alive, but with his spirit intact, and his sense of humor undiminished, establishes Anatoly Shcharansky as a man of valor and an incredible inspiration to all those who cherish freedom.

Even as we honor Mr. Shcharansky, we reflect upon the fate and renew our commitment to the over 2 million Jews for whom liberty is a fading illusion and unrestrained religious observance a faraway ideal.

While even one Soviet Jew is enslaved, none of us is fully free.

While even one Soviet Jew is deprived of the right to exercise his religion, all of us are spiritually impoverished.

And so we must raise our voices now for the Jews who are still trapped in the Soviet Union.

We cannot turn away, for where else can the Jews of the Soviet Union turn for help?

We cannot remain indifferent, for who else but the United States can match the strength and power of the Soviet Union?

We did not save European Jewry over four decades ago.

Will we save Soviet Jewry today?

Forty years after the Holocaust, the issue is not whether Jews will be allowed to live, but whether they will be allowed to live as Jews.

Not whether they will perish in death camps, but whether they will languish in labor camps.

Not the annihilation of 6 million Jews, but the attempted annihilation of almost 4,000 years of Jewish history.

And so, once again, we face a terrible test.

But whatever our brethren ask of us cannot compare to what they ask of themselves.

Theirs is a story of unshakable moral strength.

They have sacrificed their jobs, they have impaired their health, they have jeopardized their safety, they have been separated from their loved ones. Yet still they carry on.

They would rather light a Sabbath candle than simply curse the darkness at noon.

They seek only to honor and uphold the sacred traditions of their faith.

Yet they live under a Government that knows no honor, that daily breaks faith with its people, from the radiation in Chernobyl to the refuseniks in Moscow.

A Government that has no shame, no moral compass, no respect for creativity or conscience, will not quickly be converted to the free emigration of Soviet Jewry—certainly not in the course of a single afternoon.

But today we take a historic step.

We send an unmistakable message to Mr. Gorbachev:

As much as we rejoice over the freedom of Anatoly Shcharansky, we will not be sidetracked or satisfied by the release of 1 individual, or even 100, however heroic or prominent they may be.

We seek to save the Jews of the Soviet Union to reclaim their humanity. And, by so doing, we can reaffirm our own.

STAR WARS

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, once again we are facing the annual debate over defense authorization levels, and one issue that is bound to be contentious is funding for the strategic defense initiative—the so-called star wars. Some Members already are concerned that the committee bill finances the program at levels substantially below the President's request. Others will be dissatisfied with the increase in the program's authorization over last year's level—especially since last year's level followed a sizable increase the year before. Given all these concerns, we can be absolutely sure of one thing concerning SDI: The debate over its 1987 authorization will be lively.

Before that debate is settled, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an article that appeared in two Vermont newspapers—the Brattleboro Reformer and the Bennington Banner—on December 14 and 17, 1985, respectively. The author points out that SDI has both an offensive and a defensive potential. Reaching an understanding with the Soviets on how to control these two aspects of SDI will be as difficult as limiting the nucle-

ar weapons that we now have. We ought to concentrate on the task at hand before we embark on further uncharted waters.

STAR WARS' TWO EDGES

The Reagan administration likes to call its spaced-based missile defense the "strategic defense initiative" and doesn't like it when people refer to it as Star Wars. But the term for it that probably annoys the administration even more is the one the Soviet Union uses, "space strike forces," because it makes the system sound more offensive than defensive.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev uses that term for self-evident public-relations purposes. But the phrase is not entirely propaganda. Star Wars could very easily play a decisive offensive role in the hands of either superpower. Even if it were used only as a shield against an adversary's incoming missiles, it could embolden an attacker to attempt a preemptive first strike. He could rely on the defensive system to ward off whatever weapons the victim of his attack was able to fire off after seeing most of his missiles destroyed in their silos.

That is one way that Star Wars has an offensive potential. More directly, it could also be used as part of a pre-emptive strike itself if its own space-based warheads were targeted at enemy missiles on the ground and not in the air. Another offensive mission for which spaced-based defenses would be ideally suited is the destruction of an adversary's orbiting reconnaissance and communications satellites. Without such satellites, an enemy is obviously much more vulnerable to a full-scale assault on its strategic forces.

Nor can the United States claim that it is entirely unaware of the double-edged feature of the strategic defense initiative. As the Union of Concerned Scientists pointed out last week in a report it released on Star Wars' offensive potential, Pentagon officials have testified to Congress that many weapons in the strategic defense initiative would first be tested or deployed as anti-satellite weapons. Finally, Star Wars would be so versatile that it could even be turned against an enemy's own Star Wars system out in space.

The spokesman for the strategic defense initiative, Major Simon Worden, does not deny these troubling aspects of the program. In response to the points raised by the Union of Concerned Scientists, he said—as other Star Wars backers have said in the past—that no system would be deployed if it could not itself be defended. He also held out the hope that Washington and Moscow could, through the arms-control process, agree to ban certain destabilizing systems or to establish "off-limits" zones for anti-satellite weapons.

As encouraging as this last assurance is, it prompts the obvious question: If the two sides could come to an agreement on the ground rules for space-based defenses, why not just get them to agree to drastic reductions in their existing arsenals? If that were possible, all of Star Wars' expense and potential for miscalculation could be avoided and the arms race could be stopped in its tracks. Let's talk with Moscow about eliminating the weapons already deployed, not about deploying new ones.

**MRS. THATCHER: THE LONE
EUROPEAN VOICE**

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week we considered a "Gratitude to Britain" resolution—House Joint Resolution 424—to express the thanks of the American people for Great Britain's assistance during the American air strike against Libya on April 14, 1986.

I was so impressed at Mrs. Thatcher's courageous and unique stand at the time of the raid that I wrote her a letter expressing my personal appreciation for her staunch support. I hope to be able to insert that letter and the Madame Prime Minister's reply in a future issue of the RECORD.

The London Sunday Times had an excellent editorial on April 20, 1986, "Alone But Right," which provides a supportive British view of the merits of Mrs. Thatcher's stand, which obviously was taken with a keen awareness of the risks in terms of internal politics. The editorial also weighs the various options open to President Reagan to counter Libyan terrorism in an effective way. In this respect, let us hope that the Libyan raid might prove, in the words of Britain's great wartime Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, "at least the end of the beginning" for such state-sponsored terrorism.

I believe that the Prime Minister deserved the "rave reviews—which she won—in America," and I strongly recommend the Sunday Times editorial to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the London (England) Sunday Times, Apr. 20, 1986]

ALONE BUT RIGHT

"I worry for the other mothers who have sons and daughters over there. But President Reagan did what he had to do. We don't believe in violence and killing people, but we did what we had to do." These are the words of the mother of Sergeant Kenneth Ford, the American killed in a Libyan bomb attack in West Berlin on April 5, and they put to shame the European reaction to the American raid on the Libyan terrorist installations from which the death of her son, and scores of others, was planned. They were spoken by a bereaved mother with no taste for revenge and encapsulate the mood of a people slow to anger, not spoiling for a fight. But they also contain the firm belief that there comes a time when a nation has to stand up for itself, whatever the fears for the sons and daughters of "other mothers", if it is to retain its self-respect. President Reagan decided the time had come last week, and the vast majority of Americans agreed. The Europeans did not, and started the Americans wondering aloud just what sort of allies it has been defending these past 40 years.

Given the outpouring of anti-Americanism which has engulfed Europe since the raid on Tripoli it is as well to remember what Sergeant Ford was doing in West Berlin in the first place. He was one of more than 300,000 Americans stationed on this side of the Atlantic to defend the democracies of Western Europe. Yet his death, the latest atrocity in the wave of terror which has swept Europe with increasing intensity in the past 18 months, was greeted in Europe with nothing

like the same outrage which was directed at the Americans for bombing those in Libya responsible for his death.

THE MEANING OF A GOOD ALLY

The Americans have no right to expect unquestioning obedience from allies which are also free nations—that is the way of the Warsaw Pact. But they had every right to expect better of their European allies last week. Good allies should give each other the benefit of the doubt. That is what the United States did when Britain went to battle with Argentina over the Falklands: America gave vital logistical and intelligence support, despite many doubts in Washington about British policy, because America wanted to stand by an old and trusted ally. Similarly, Mrs Thatcher stood by Reagan when America asked permission to use its British-based F-111s to bomb Libya, overriding the doubts in Whitehall about bombing being the best way to retaliate against terrorism. The rest of America's allies in Europe, however, seemed anxious to give everybody but America the benefit of the doubt: they even quibbled about the evidence proving Colonel Gadaffi's guilt, evidence which Senator Patrick Leahy, a Democratic critic of the president and himself a former prosecutor, had no hesitation in describing as "the kind of proof I'd go to court with."

The European position was especially indefensible because it offered no credible alternative policy. For months the United States had been pleading with the Europeans to support joint action against Libya by imposing diplomatic and economic sanctions. And for months the European leaders met in various European capitals to discuss joint approaches to terrorism in much the same way they meet periodically to discuss the butter mountain or the olive oil lake.

THE PRICE OF TERROR

Of course, it is being said that bombing Libya will not end terrorism, and might even encourage more. The president acknowledged that in his television address on Monday night. But intelligence reports showed that Colonel Gadaffi planned more terrorist attacks long before his installations were bombed. Only three weeks ago a Libyan plot was uncovered to bomb civilians queuing for visas at the American embassy in Paris; on April 6 a Libyan-inspired attack on the American embassy in Beirut failed only because the rocket exploded on launch; and attacks on American facilities in 10 African countries were to follow. Gadaffi needs no excuse for terrorism: American retaliation could hardly make things worse, and might just act as a deterrent by reducing his terrorist capabilities. Those who say it will only bolster his power base inside Libya and the Arab world might be right in the short run. In the longer run there is every chance it will strengthen those internal forces who want to be rid of him.

In our view, a better policy would have been a covert attack on him, his accomplices and his terror camps, using special forces, which would have given far greater precision than so-called surgical bombing and would have run far less of a risk of harming innocent civilians. One of the purposes of terrorism is to force governments to meet terror with terror, dragging democracy down in the process. But the killing of children should play no part in retaliation against terrorism by civilized nations, which must always avoid being forced to behave like terrorists themselves. The ability of the United States to mount such covert oper-

ations, however, is not encouraging. Although strengthened again from the low point after the Vietnam war, its covert capability is not up to the task the Americans wanted to carry out last week. The president therefore chose what was probably the only military option available.

STANDING ALONE, ON THE RIGHT SIDE

As with rescuing of Grenada for democracy three years ago, so with the bombing of Libya last week: a more confident, assertive America is striding the world stage again these days, and it makes Europeans nervous. The simple certainties of the Reagan years bring their own dangers. But they have brought successes at home and abroad too, confounding sophisticated critics in the process, and they come at a time when Europe's diminished economic and political status in the world makes European politicians certain of nothing. The leader of the Atlantic alliance and its allies are now clearly on different wavelengths. The current state of ill will was best summed up by the bitter remark of one senator who commented that he did not remember the French complaining of American bombers flying over France in 1944. Opinion polls this week showed that almost eight out of 10 Americans approved of the attack on Libya, whereas almost seven out of 10 Britons disapproved. Elsewhere in Europe, the disapproval was even greater. Mrs. Thatcher found herself a lone European voice, winning rave reviews in America but raising talk at home, even among those who at one stage loyally supported her, that the sacrifice she made to keep the alliance together may have cost her the next election. Those same people made the same arguments in the same tones when the task force embarked for the Falklands. If Mrs. Thatcher does lose an election on an issue where she has been on the right side of the argument, it would be an extraordinary harsh judgment on the part of the electorate.

**WARREN BROOKES EXPOSES
DEMOCRATS' DEFENSE PLANS**

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, in his recent Washington Times column entitled "Will the Democrats Sell Out Defense?" columnist Warren Brookes patiently and clearly exposes the Democratic game plan on defense: "To abort the Reagan defense revival."

Democratic defense budget proposals for fiscal year 1987 represent the lowest GNP percentage for defense outlays since 1982, and the smallest GNP percentage for defense budget authority since 1981. It is as if Ronald Reagan had never been elected President, and Jimmy Carter had been allowed to continue promoting his anemic defense spending proposals.

Congress made a commitment to provide 3 percent real growth in defense spending in 1987, but the Democrat budget proposal actually represents no real growth at all. The Soviet military threat inexorably grows, but the Congress only shrinks from the challenge. Mr. Brookes' column on this subject is worthy of your attention.

[From the Washington Times, May 14, 1986]

WILL DEMOCRATS SELL OUT DEFENSE?
(By Warren Brookes)

Most American monetary experts have been shocked by how rapidly the dollar has fallen against world currencies—much more than monetary policies alone would have suggested.

They are ignoring the one nonmonetary fundamental that has been changing even more rapidly than our monetary policies: our rapid abandonment of the original Carter-Reagan defense buildup, signaled both by the 1986 defense budget freeze, and the dangerous proposals by the Democrats on the House Budget Committee to slash 1987-1989 defense spending back to pre-Afghanistan and pre-Reagan levels.

Weak defense has always meant weak currency, and vice versa. It is no accident that from 1974 to 1979, while national defense spending was slashed from 5.8 percent of GNP to 4.7 percent (the lowest in postwar history), the U.S. dollar plunged from 101 percent of the 1973 index to 84, also its lowest level in modern history.

It is equally no accident that under the defense buildup started by President Jimmy Carter in 1980-81 (after the invasion of Afghanistan) and carried on by President Reagan which raised defense outlays from 4.7 to 5.9 percent of gross national product in Mr. Carter's last budget (FY 1982) and to 6.4 percent in FY 1985, the U.S. dollar soared from 88 to 157.

But since April 1985, the dollar has plunged to 113 percent of its 1973 value—a shocking 29 percent decline which actually began at the precise moment that President Reagan was forced by his own Senate to agree to a 1986 defense freeze—a sure signal the defense buildup was over.

That declining defense posture picture was reinforced not only by the recent Senate decision to cut Mr. Reagan's defense budget authority for 1987 from \$320 to \$301 billion (\$253 billion in constant 1982 dollars) but by the ominous proposals now coming out of the House Budget Committee to slash that budget authority still further, to \$285 billion (\$240 billion in 1982 dollars).

That proposal amounts to a 10 percent real (constant dollar) cut in budget authority from 1985, and, as a percent of GNP, would take us back to the same level of spending we had in 1981, before the Reagan buildup.

In short, the House Democrats are proposing to abort the entire Reagan defense revival, long before it has even reached the timid 1986 levels which a frightened Jimmy Carter suddenly proposed in January of 1980, after the fall of Kabul.

The fact they are willing to risk such a savage assault on national security shows how skillfully the Democrats and their media colleagues have been able to paint the Reagan defense buildup in so much bigger and more wasteful terms than actually took place.

Last February, the House Budget Committee published a highly misleading table showing the "huge" Reagan defense buildup, comparing it to defense spending since 1950—but it deliberately left out any factor for inflation, making all spending since 1973 look far larger than it really was, when for most of those years, it was plunging in real value.

This chart was sent out, with stunning impact, to their constituents by a large number of liberal, anti-defense Democrats such as Rep. Ed Markey of Massachusetts.

Yet, had they been really honest with their constituents, they would have sent out the other chart which shows defense spending as a share of GNP—and how steeply it has actually fallen since the peacetime budgets of the Eisenhower administration, when it averaged more than 10 percent, compared with only 6.2 percent as proposed by Mr. Reagan for 1987, which, in turn, is nearly 40 percent less than the pre-Vietnam Kennedy budgets of 1962 and 1963.

That kind of information might have forestalled the kind of outrageous proposals Democrats are now making that would cut current defense outlays back to 6.1 percent of GNP, the lowest level since 1982, and budget authority back to 6.2 percent, the lowest since 1981, a dangerous drawback in defense posture.

During the peak of the Reagan defense buildup in 1984 and 1985, a buildup that followed closely the Carter proposals of 1980-81, budget authority reached 7.6 percent of GNP—and Mr. Reagan's proposal for 1987, at 7.0 percent, was actually a substantial fallback from that level, as is the 6.6 percent level recently passed by the Senate.

Now the House proposes to cut that back to 6.2 percent, or just about where it was before Mr. Carter got hit in the head by Soviet reality in Afghanistan.

House Democrats would have you believe this is all because of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings—but actually the House proposes to go below the GHR targets by \$10 billion or so—even without allowing for lower total outlays and deficits due to falling interest rates.

More important, the Senate tax reform bill, like the House version, already contains a \$31 billion windfall for FY 1986 and FY 1987 because it repeals the Investment Tax Credit as of January 1, 1986, even though individual rates are not cut until 1987. This alone would obviate any need either for tax increases in FY 1987 or draconian defense cuts.

In short, they are cutting defense because that's what they have always done—and the Russians are smiling, again.

**CONTRA AID WILL PRODUCE
MORE, NOT FEWER, CENTRAL
AMERICAN REFUGEES**

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, one of the numerous pieces of misinformation that we are constantly subjected to by the Reagan administration, in its attempt to justify its misguided Contra aid policy, is that that policy will somehow help prevent Central American refugees from fleeing to the United States. This view is not shared by specialists; unfortunately, they do not have the administration's access to the media, so their views tend to be lost in all the rhetoric.

In this regard, I wanted to call my colleagues' attention to a recent study by two experts: Dr. Patricia Weiss Fagen, staff associate of the Refugee Policy Group in Washington, DC, and associate professor of history at San Jose State University in California; and Dr. Sergio Aguayo, professor at El Colegio de Mexico in Mexico City. The study is published by the Central American and Caribbean Pro-

gram at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. I would like to share with my colleagues a brief introduction to the study written by the editor. Copies of the complete study may be obtained by contacting the Central American and Caribbean Program.

The material referred to follows:

INTRODUCTION

The two essays published jointly in this CACP Occasional Paper focus on the dramatic plight of Central America's refugees in the early 1980s. Since the original field work was done by Dr. Patricia Weiss Fagen and Dr. Sergio Aguayo in 1983-84, the ongoing conflicts in the region have exacerbated the refugee problem even further. As a result, some of the data cited in these two articles understate the current situation. The CACP at SAIS feels that the basic problems and trends highlighted by each author retain considerable analytic utility despite the gap between academic publication and the changing realities they examine.

In a public appeal made on March 3, 1986, designed to generate support for a \$100 million aid package for the "Contra" rebels fighting against the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua, President Ronald Reagan warned his critics that the United States was facing a "strategic disaster" of great magnitude and a "vast migration" of refugees if Congress turned down his latest request.¹ In point of fact, as both Fagen and Aguayo emphasize, the turbulent conditions in Central America have already converted the refugee exodus from the region into a problem of major consequence for both Mexico and the United States. Indeed, with every day that the fighting in the area continues, the problem inexorably becomes more acute as more victims flee the maelstrom.

There is widespread consensus among analysts of Central America that \$100 million more in U.S. aid to the Nicaraguan Contras will not topple the Sandinistas, nor will it resolve the region's development problems. Quite to the contrary, new "lethal" assistance from Washington will inevitably intensify the conflicts and compound the economic and social disruption in Nicaragua and surrounding countries which lay at the heart of the mounting refugee problem in Central America. Whether justifiable or not on other grounds, to argue that aid to the Contras will help prevent more refugees from appearing in the region is patently inconsistent and illogical.

Although President Reagan has repeatedly made reference to "feet people" fleeing the "totalitarian" Sandinista regime (and there have undoubtedly been some), Dr. Fagen's research, in particular, indicates that Nicaraguan refugees comprise only a small portion of the total number of Central Americans who have abandoned their homelands in search of personal safety and economic survival. The great bulk of the current Central American refugee population comes from El Salvador and Guatemala where internal wars, the lack of economic opportunities, and the abuses of past authoritarian military rulers have created a tidal wave of immigration out of the area. If the U.S. Congress chooses to renew its financial backing for the "Contra" war, the

¹ See Lou Cannon and Joanne Omang, "Reagan Warns of Disaster If Hill Bars \$100 Million to Contras," the Washington Post, March 4, 1986, p. A-21.

analyses presented here make it crystal clear that more—rather than fewer—refugees can be expected to be caught up in the Central American diaspora.

BRUCE MICHAEL BAGLEY,
Editor, CACP Occasional Paper Series.

FOOD STAMPS VERSUS ICBM'S

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues an exchange of letters between me and the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Hon. Donald A. Hicks. These letters shed some light on this administration's budget priorities.

Earlier this month, Mr. Hicks had an interview with the press on strategic offensive weapons. In an excellent article by James Gerstenzang in the Los Angeles Times, Mr. Hicks was quoted as favoring deployment of Midgetman, "recognizing that it costs a lot of money and prevents the Democrats from giving a lot of food stamps out they might give out otherwise."

I wrote to Mr. Hicks to express my surprise and concern that a high official of the Department of Defense would make such a statement. I noted that support for food stamps has been bipartisan and that the Food Stamp Program is substantially less costly than Midgetman—in fact we could fund food stamps through the rest of the decade for less than Midgetman will cost. Finally, I noted that since the Reagan administration took office, cost growth in Defense research, development, testing, and evaluation [RDT&E] has been substantially higher than increased spending for food stamps.

In response to my letter, Mr. Hicks wrote a most gracious reply in which he did not deny the quotation but argued that his remark had been taken out of context. He wrote that he had meant to say that some Members of Congress, particularly supporters of domestic programs such as food stamps, are unwilling to consider relatively inexpensive solutions to ICBM modernization, as he characterizes the administration's MX proposal, while they support what he considers the more costly program such as Midgetman.

Frankly, while Mr. Hicks' reply is gracious, his answer to my letter highlights the dilemma we confront in attempting to control defense spending. When we reauthorized the Food Stamp Program last year, every facet of the program was carefully scrutinized. My fellow Members on the Agriculture Committee and our colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee had to share an increase of \$0.30 billion in fiscal year 1986 for nutrition programs, including food stamps, WIC, and school lunch. Yet in a throw-away line, an official who makes recommendations involving \$50 billion weapons systems talks about "giving a lot of food stamps out."

I submit that if we subjected the Defense budget to the same scrutiny that we insist on for domestic programs, such as food stamps, we would not be confronted with the budget

crisis which has paralyzed the Federal Government over the past several years.

Material mentioned above follows:

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, April 21, 1986.

HON. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 9, 1986. I want to assure you that the remarks attributed to me in a April 4, 1986 Los Angeles Times article which concerned you, were taken out of context. It was not my intent to criticize any particular domestic program, but to point up the curious fact that some who are concerned about the impact of defense spending on domestic programs are at the same time insensitive to potential cost tradeoffs in the defense area which could save many taxpayer dollars.

Specifically, during a discussion of alternative approaches to completing our land-based ICBM modernization program, I outlined the costs associated with various options for deploying a second 50 MX missiles. I pointed out that these options are substantially cheaper than the \$50 billion it is estimated to cost to deploy the baseline, single-warhead Midgetman. In fact, we could deploy an additional 50 MX missiles in Minuteman silos for about 1/25 the cost of Midgetman.

I then expressed surprise that some members of Congress, particularly some strong supporters of domestic programs such as food stamps, seem so unwilling to consider relatively inexpensive solutions to our ICBM modernization problem while readily embracing a more expensive program such as Midgetman.

As Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, one of my responsibilities is to see that we pursue the most cost effective solutions to meeting defense requirements. Only by achieving this objective can we hope to meet critical needs for national defense and support legitimate domestic requirements.

I regret that the thought did not come through clearly in the reportage, as carried in the Times.

Sincerely,

DONALD A. HICKS.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC MARKETING, CONSUMER RELATIONS, AND NUTRITION,

Washington, DC, April 9, 1986.

HON. DONALD A. HICKS,
Undersecretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HICKS: I am writing to express my profound concern about the remarks attributed to you in an article by James Gerstenzang which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on April 4, 1986.

The article notes that you favor deployment of the Midgetman because you believe it provides greater survivability to our nuclear deterrent than would the MX. Even though the Midgetman costs 25 times as much as the same number of MX missiles, the article quotes you as saying:

"I'm all for doing that [deploying Midgetman], recognizing that it costs a lot of money and prevents the Democrats from giving a lot of food stamps out that they might give out otherwise."

I am both surprised and concerned that a high official of the Department of Defense would have such a distorted view of defense and budget priorities. I hope that we both agree that the most important function of the Federal government in this thermonuclear age is to avoid a nuclear holocaust which could destroy both the United States and the Soviet Union as viable societies. While reasonable people may disagree about whether deployment of Midgetman would increase or decrease our national security, I think that it is highly inappropriate for an official of the Department of Defense to argue for a \$50 billion weapon system on the grounds that it will keep nutrition assistance from being provided to poor Americans.

Your reported comments betray some ignorance of the Food Stamp Program. In the first place, support for this program cuts across party lines. One of the strongest supporters of the program has been the Republican Majority Leader of the Senate, Robert Dole of Kansas. In the second place, we could fund the Food Stamp Program through the rest of this decade for substantially less than you seek for Midgetman. In the third place, cost growth in the Food Stamp Program since the Reagan administration took office has been substantially less than the cost growth in Defense research and development. The increase in Defense RDT&E between fiscal year 1981 when the Reagan administration took office and the President's request for fiscal year 1987 was 107 percent in current dollars and 168 percent in constant 1982 dollars. In contrast, funding for food stamps over the same period will increase only 16 percent of current dollars and 50 percent in constant dollars.

The projection of cost growth in food stamps assumes that the Congress will accept the recommendation of the Republican-controlled Senate Budget Committee to reject the cuts proposed by the President in the Food Stamp Program.

Finally, your reported comments show a remarkable insensitivity to the budgetary crisis which in large part has been created by the increase in Defense spending since 1981. If Midgetman is needed for strategic reasons, you should base the justification for spending the \$50 billion on those grounds. If you really consider Defense spending a way to avoid spending on a program which you apparently dislike, I think you reveal an alarming insensitivity to the deficit crisis which we in the Congress have been trying to resolve. Frankly, we could go a long way toward eliminating the deficit if we subjected Defense spending to the same scrutiny that the Food Stamp Program has experienced in recent years.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 4, 1986]

MIDGETMAN 25 TIMES COSTLIER BUT IS NECESSARY, PENTAGON SAYS

(By James Gerstenzang)

WASHINGTON.—A senior Pentagon official, outlining Administration plans to push for additional MX missiles and weighing their cost against the Midgetman missile, said Thursday that the smaller weapon will cost 25 times as much to obtain the same number of warheads but that it is needed to reinforce the nation's nuclear force.

Donald A. Hicks, undersecretary of defense for research and engineering, said the

more expensive Midgetman program will offer greater survivability to the nation's nuclear deterrent.

"I'm all for doing that, recognizing that it costs a lot of money and prevents the Democrats from giving a lot of food stamps out that they might give out otherwise," he said at a breakfast with Pentagon reporters.

"The cost issue is a real issue," he said, estimating that \$50 billion is needed to fund that Midgetman program. Pentagon officials believe the single-warhead missile's mobility would help it survive an enemy missile attack.

His comments summed up the "guns vs. butter" dilemma facing the Administration as it enters another budget battle with a Congress that has become ever more reluctant to meet President Reagan's request for an 8 percent after-inflation Pentagon budget increase.

At the same time, the Pentagon official continued the debate over the modernization of the nation's nuclear arsenal, emphasizing the Administration's desire to eventually deploy 100 MX missiles, rather than the 50 authorized by Congress.

Hicks said that "all kinds of hysterical" reasons had been cited for cutting deployment of the 10-warhead weapon in half. Opponents of the missile, he said, are "disturbed" because it would carry 10 nuclear warheads, but they "don't seem to be disturbed by (Soviet) SS-18 with 14" warheads.

Hicks, a former executive of Northrop Corp., which is building the Advanced Technology Bomber, also known as the Stealth Bomber, for the Air Force, is the senior Pentagon official in charge of new weapons. He said an additional 50 MX missiles would cost about \$2 billion. The Administration is seeking \$1.4 billion in fiscal 1987 to buy 21 MXs.

For an additional \$6 billion, he said, 50 missiles could be placed in "super-hard" silos, rather than in old Minuteman missile silos in which the MXs are now scheduled to be deployed, beginning late this year.

In the past, Hicks has raised the possibility of placing two or three warheads on the Midgetman, known officially as the small intercontinental ballistic missile. Congress has insisted that the missile carry one warhead and weigh no more than 30,000 pounds.

Hicks indicated that sufficient caution must be exercised so it can be determined whether the nation would be better served by building one-third as many Midgetman missiles as planned, and equipping them with three warheads.

He said that such engineering studies may take two years, but could demonstrate that a two-warhead missile could still be sufficiently mobile, thus cutting in half the number of missiles and launchers needed at a savings of \$8 billion to \$10 billion.

Current plans call for deploying 500 of the missiles, beginning in late 1992. They would be placed in mobile launchers, protected against the effects of an enemy missile attack, and deployed on military reservations in the West.

HOUSE RESTAURANT SYSTEM

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, recently a number of Members have requested informa-

tion regarding the working conditions and benefits of congressional staff in our House restaurant system. The report that follows was prepared by the Architect of the Capitol who advises that similar benefits are available to staff in the Senate restaurant system.

(1) Restaurant Staffing:

	Total	Management	Employees
House restaurants.....	249	4	245
Senate restaurants.....	254	4	250

(2) Hourly Pay Range:

House restaurants.....	\$4.80-\$8.50
Senate restaurants.....	\$4.80-\$8.50
Private sector.....	\$3.85-\$8.15

(3) Value of Benefits: 41 percent of base pay.

(4) Benefits:

Annual Leave—13 days, 1st 3 years of service; 20 days, 3 to 15 years of service; 26 days, Over 15 years of service.

Sick Leave—13 days a year.

Retirement—80 percent of high three years base salary after 32 years of Congressional and military service at age 55.

Life Insurance—Coverage is equal to actual base pay plus \$2,000; additional optional and family coverage is available.

Health Benefits—Choice of 28 plans covering worker and all eligible family members. Workers' Compensation—In case of injury, worker entitled to 45 days continuation of pay and payment of medical bills.

Death Gratuity—Benefit payable to widow, widower or legal heir: For employee with 6 years of service: ½ years salary; For employee with 18 years of service: 1 years salary.

Holidays—Ten paid holidays a year.

Free Meals—A breakfast and lunch are provided each work day at no cost to the employee at a retail cost to the restaurants of \$5.50 a day or approximately \$1,300 a year.

Parking—Free parking available on limited basis; presently 143 employees have parking.

(5) Employee Relations:

Policy and procedures have been implemented in the following areas: Posting of Vacancies, Training Program for all employees, Disciplinary and adverse action appeal system, Grievance and hearing system, Pay schedules adjusted periodically to match changes in Federal prevailing rate schedules, Employment continued through all recess periods, Overtime pay for all work in excess of 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a work week.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. MAJ. JAMES B. WHITTAKER

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to inform my colleagues and pay tribute to an outstanding member of the U.S. Army, Sgt. Maj. Jim Whittaker, of Barnett, MO.

Sergeant Major Whittaker was the adjutant general sergeant major, Fort Leonard Wood, MO, at the time of his untimely death from cardiac arrest on April 20, 1986. He was 45.

Before beginning military service to his country in 1961, Sergeant Major Whittaker graduated from Pensacola Technical High School in Pensacola, FL, and attended Greenleaf College in Atlanta, GA. Along with serving two tours in Heidelberg, West Germany, he also served a combat tour in Vietnam, with the 1st Personnel Services Company.

Jim Whittaker was the operations NCO of the reception station at Fort Leonard Wood before receiving his promotion to sergeant major and becoming the senior noncommissioned officer for the adjutant general. He was a dual component soldier, serving as a chief warrant officer, W-4, in the U.S. Army Reserve.

His many awards include the Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Army Commendation Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, the Army Achievement Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, seven awards of the Good Conduct Medal, the Meritorious Unit Commendation, and the Republic of Vietnam Cross of Gallantry with Palm.

Sergeant Major Whittaker is survived by his wife Barbara, his son Jay, his daughters Rhonda and Natalie, his mother Mrs. Anna Whittaker of Lawrenceburg, TN, three brothers—two of whom are retired U.S. Army noncommissioned officers—and four sisters.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Major Whittaker will be remembered by his family and friends as a person of rare competence and compassion who could be depended upon to do what was right for his soldiers, his Army and his country. I feel certain that each Member of this House joins me in sending our deepest sympathies to his wife and family. May God comfort them in this time of deep sorrow.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK D'ASCENSIO, ESQ.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to one of Newark's finest civil servants, Frank D'Ascensio, municipal clerk, city of Newark.

Frank D'Ascensio has been serving the people of Newark since 1931. It is exactly 55 years and 1 month after his initial temporary position with the city of Newark.

Frank D'Ascensio was born on September 8, 1903 in New York City, the year of the first airplane flight and the first feature motion picture, of immigrant parents from Italy. At the age of 5 Frank's family moved to Newark, NJ, where Frank has lived ever since.

Frank attended school in Newark and graduated from Barringer High School. He later earned a degree in electrical engineering from Cornell University in 1927 and a degree in law from the Mercer Beasley Law School (later Rutgers University) in 1931. In 1935 he was admitted to the New Jersey bar, and in 1941 he was certified as a professional land surveyor.

Meanwhile, because of the dearth of opportunities for engineers and/or attorneys during the Great Depression, Frank had taken a tem-

porary position with the city of Newark, and on April 16, 1931 he began work as a deputy collector of personal tax arrears. Five years later he was promoted to the permanent position of assistant tax assessor.

Frank rose through the ranks during the next two decades in the division of assessments and in 1957 he transferred to the office of the city clerk as an analyst. Three brief years later he acquired the title of chief analyst and mastered operations of this complex office under the tutelage of his predecessor, Harry Reichenstein. When Mr. Reichenstein retired at the age of 75 in 1971, Frank became municipal clerk of the largest municipality in the State of New Jersey. Frank attained tenure in this position in 1976 and during the last 15 years his staff has grown in both size and stature—a model for the Nation.

Frank has been honored for outstanding performance by local, county, State and national organizations, and he is known throughout the Nation as the dean of municipal clerks. In 1974 he became the first municipal clerk from New Jersey to be named to a committee of the International Institute of Municipal Clerks, and in 1980 he was awarded the degree of certified municipal clerk by the International Institute.

Apart from his professional association and interests, Frank and his late wife Mildred were devoted to their family and their church. Frank has been a communicant of Saint Francis Xavier Church for 58 years and he still attends weekly mass there.

Frank has two children. His son, Frank Paul D'Ascenso, is superintendent of industrial waste control for the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission. His daughter, Barbara Bennett, is a junior high school teacher. He has four grandsons and two granddaughters.

Frank seems unable to find time to grow old. While workers not even a third of his age wait for the elevators, Frank can be seen briskly walking up the stairs to his third floor office.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Frank for his many contributions to our community, and I wish him well in the years to come.

WEST NANTICOKE METHODIST CHURCH CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to your attention the 100th anniversary of the West Nanticoke Church in the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania. I am proud to join in the celebration of this centennial, and I am glad to have the opportunity to share this event with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

The 11th Congressional District which I represent has a long tradition of religious observance and service to God. We are a diverse people, represented by the many different churches, temples, and synagogues which dot our countryside. But our common bond is a commitment and belief in the power and glory of a loving God.

The First United Methodist Church of West Nanticoke is a special part of that tradition. Its distinguished history stretches beyond the last 100 years to the beginning of a union Sunday School which had been held in West Nanticoke for some time prior to 1872. It ran only through the warm weather and was under the leadership of Baptists, including the Baptist minister Reverend Sheerer. In the fall of 1872, Jacob Bonawitz formed a Methodist Sunday School to continue through the winter. Mr. Bonawitz served the 100 members as superintendent, and several ministers from nearby Plymouth alternated preaching in the morning and evening. In 1874 West Nanticoke joined with Nanticoke for pastoral oversight until 1886, when it became a charge with C.S. Lane as pastor.

The church edifice was built in 1886 and was rededicated on Sunday, August 18, 1901. Rev. A. Griffin preached in the morning, Rev. A.J. Cleft in the afternoon, and Rev. W.H. Hiller in the evening.

Two floods inflicted tremendous damage to the West Nanticoke Church. The spring of 1936 brought the highest recorded flood in the history of the Wyoming Valley, and the church members worked with the Red Cross during this emergency. Hurricane Agnes struck in 1972 and wreaked havoc on the entire area. From the motor and blowers of the organ to the paneling and tile of the vestibule, the church was severely damaged. Through the hard work and dedication of the congregation, the church basement and the parsonage were restored within a year.

Throughout its trials and triumphs, the congregation of the First United Methodist Church of West Nanticoke has endured, providing testimony to the strength of faith. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to call your attention to this milestone in the history of this fine church. I am sure that you join me in wishing all those involved with this exciting event our sincerest and most heartfelt congratulations.

CONGRESSMAN GILMAN IN SUPPORT OF HOUSING REAUTHORIZATION

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the Housing Act of 1986, and I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY], for yielding time to me today and for his leadership as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development in developing and improving our major housing and community development programs. I also wish to express my appreciation to his colleague, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], for his hard work and dedication to ensuring the continued viability of our housing programs. The Gonzalez-McKinney substitute that is being offered today, H.R. 4746, is the product of countless hours of consultation and negotiation between the minority and majority members of the

House Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs. This measure is a fair and reasoned response to the urgent need to reauthorize these programs, many of which have been functioning under short-term extensions since the end of fiscal year 1985 last September.

Rather than detain this reauthorization any longer than it has already been, the committee wisely chose not to set specific funding levels in this bill and to include a general policy statement that all fiscal year 1986-87 authorizations must be capped at levels established by the pending budget resolution. H.R. 4746 further extends through fiscal year 1987, the FHA mortgage insurance programs, the Section 312 Rehabilitation Loan Program, Federal flood and crime insurance programs—with a 10-percent cap on premium increases—and FmHA rental and mutual and self-help housing programs. H.R. 4746 also retains the 9.25-percent cap on section 202 housing loans, authorizing that program through fiscal year 1987 and extends HMDA through fiscal year 1988. All of these programs are being utilized extensively throughout my congressional district in New York and are programs that for many elderly and handicapped individuals and countless families, have meant the difference between having a roof over their heads and being homeless.

Concomitant with our support for legislation which makes safe, reliable housing available to all individuals regardless of their income should be a commitment by this Congress to the development of our local communities and neighborhoods. Indeed improved housing opportunities and coordinated community and neighborhood development programs are integral components in any effort to improve the overall quality of community life. While the administration continues to target both of these programs for elimination, I am pleased that the committee has recognized the vital infusion of Federal dollars the CDBG and UDAG Programs afford our distressed towns and cities and have reauthorized the Community Development Block Grant and Urban Development Block Grant Programs through fiscal year 1987.

In this regard, I commend the committee particularly for including a provision in this legislation which will allow 19 U.S. cities to continue to compete for CDBG funding for 3 more years. Since 1983, cities classified as central cities for the purposes of being eligible for CDBG moneys have faced the threat of losing their entitlement status due to arbitrary criteria promulgated by the Office of Management and Budget. These regulations changed the method of defining central cities and/or the fluctuations in populations in our cities in the years between the decennial censuses. The 19 cities affected by these regulations have been caught in a vital catch-22. Because their population has decreased they are being deprived of the very funds they need to retain and attract businesses. Among the 19 cities affected by the OMB regulations are the cities of Middletown and Newburgh in Orange County, NY. As the Representative from Middletown and the former Representative of Newburgh, I know that I speak for all the constituents in our mid-Hudson Valley region when I thank the committee for recognizing

the significant work that has been completed and can continue to be executed, with CDBG funding. These two cities have worked extremely hard to overcome both regional and national problems. In Middletown alone CDBG moneys are helping to change the face of Middletown. The repaving of streets, the installation of street lamps, the revitalization of the old train station, rehabilitation of old housing to make it habitable—all of these projects paid for, in part, with CDBG moneys, have helped Middletown enter into a new era, an era of growth and prosperity which will ultimately benefit the entire region. I am hopeful that the 3-year extension of the central cities included in H.R. 4746 will allow these 19 cities adequate time to explore alternate funding options and for Congress to examine the possibility of a more permanent solution.

In addition, H.R. 4746 authorizes the section 8 and public housing programs through fiscal year 1987 and establishes a utility allowance for families in public housing who must make separate utility payments. Other welcome changes in the section 8 program include: amend the income eligibility requirements for assisted housing to all 25 percent—up from 5 percent—of assisted housing units to be leased to families with income between 50 percent and 80 percent of the area median, and; authorizes HUD to replace the Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program with a new grant program to improve the physical condition of existing public housing projects and to upgrade their management and operation.

My district borders both sides of the Hudson River, a portion of which lies within 20 miles of New York City. While many of my constituents commute or do business in New York, a significant portion of the 22d Congressional District is rural and has been federally designated as such, allowing many of my constituents to be eligible for assistance under the rural housing programs. I am pleased to note that this substitute measure reauthorizes the rural housing insurance fund and the rural housing grant programs which have permitted so many individuals and families in our rural areas to own their own homes.

The committee has also responded to the growing incidence of homelessness in this Nation. I recently had the opportunity to visit several homeless shelter facilities in Westchester County, NY. Our local municipalities cannot be expected to bear the entire burden of housing and of feeding the homeless. H.R. 4746 establishes two new programs to aid the homeless which: Creates a new second-stage housing demonstration program for homeless and displaced person unable to live independently, and establishes the National Emergency Food and Shelter Board to administer shelter assistance programs. In addition the committee has authorized such sums as may be necessary to advance this new initiative and requires the National Emergency Food and Shelter Board to make matching grants to the State and local governments and nonprofit organizations for assistance to the homeless.

In closing, I want to urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity—a reauthorization of these housing and community development programs are desperately needed—and vote for adoption of this legislation. I entreat my

colleagues to vote "aye" on the Gonzalez-McKinney substitute and aye on this final passage or this worthy legislation.

THE PRODUCT LIABILITY UNIFORM STANDARDS AND REFORM ACT

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the United States is a litigious society, but until recently this penchant to sue was just America's way of redressing her grievances. Now it threatens the very heart of society by reducing the availability, adequacy and affordability of insurance thus affecting the existence of a variety of consumer goods and services. The apparent culprit in this scheme of devastation is none other than the vast array of State tort laws.

Manufacturers, sellers, insurance companies and consumers are all victims. Manufacturers are unable to manufacture quality products free from the threat of paralyzing litigation because they cannot predict, with any regularity, the impact of 50 different State laws on their product. Our current tort system is nothing more than a myriad of disjointed rules pertaining to what actions or omissions will be determinative of liability and who will pay. Similarly, insurance companies are unable to determine with sufficient precision the potential for, and extent of, possible liability under such a wide variety of laws. Most importantly this unpredictable system leaves corporations and consumers unprotected and unable to purchase reasonable insurance. Most frustrating for businesses is that denial of insurance is not always linked to risks associated with their product or history of service. Ultimately, inability to obtain insurance can result in business forfeiture, bankruptcy and higher cost to the consumer.

The upheaval in the liability system is reflected in both the size and number of awards. The number of product liability cases filed in Federal district court soared from 1,579 in 1974 to 13,554 in 1985, a 758-percent increase. Similarly the average size of awards has tripled during the past 25 years from an average of \$49,000 in the early 1960's to \$130,000 in the late 1970's. The increase in the average is largely due to the dramatic increase in awards over \$1 million. In the 1960's, awards that exceeded \$1 million accounted for only 8 percent of damages awarded. In the late 1970's, however, awards of \$1 million and up accounted for 48 percent of all awards. Equally at fault is the increase in punitive damage awards. These awards, intended only to penalize, have increased approximately 12,000 percent since the early 1960's from levels between \$4,000 to \$54,000 in the 1960's to \$395,000 to \$489,000 in the late 1970's.

In my home State of California, cities have paid \$75.4 million in "deep pocket" liability claims and defense costs in the last 3 years alone. In addition, a League of California Cities study of 347 municipalities, including 23

in my home county of Orange County, found that nearly \$250 million in claims are pending. The response to this situation has been to put proposition 51 on the June 3, 1986 ballot. This proposal would limit a city's liability to its percentage of fault. While I commend the organizers of the proposition 51 coalition for a prompt response to this crisis, I believe that the extent of this problem and its adverse impact on interstate commerce demands Federal action.

It is clear that our tort system, which was designed to compensate the victim for wrongful injury, has become so debilitated that the question of liability is now a secondary issue. A few examples highlight the dramatic shift away from fault-based compensation standards: A 41-year-old body builder in California entered a footrace with a refrigerator strapped to his back. During the race a strap slipped and he was injured. He collected \$1 million in damages, Colombo versus Transworld International, et al. Two Maryland men decided to dry their hot air balloon in a clothes dryer. When the dryer exploded the men were injured and collected \$885,000 in damages, American Laundry Machinery versus Horan.

For the above reasons, I am introducing the Product Liability Voluntary Claims and Uniform Standards Act of 1986. This bill would preempt conflicting State law and provide for uniform standards of liability. The most salient features of the bill include elimination of joint and several liability in favor of comparative responsibility, a cap on punitive damages to two times the amount of economic damages or \$100,000, whichever is less, settlement incentives and an alternative dispute resolution mechanism. While I recognize that no one bill will be the cure-all, I do believe that uniform laws will add stability and predictability to the system which will result in improved underwriting practices and ultimately available and affordable insurance.

A comprehensive reform of our fragmented tort system is long overdue and I submit this bill with the hope that it will serve as a vehicle for reform. I welcome a discussion of this and other proposals aimed at reform of our Nation's tort laws. While I believe my bill represents a balance of all interests involved and is the most comprehensive effort to date, I am amenable to any suggestions which may improve this approach. I urge the Energy and Commerce and Judiciary Committees to schedule hearings and expedite consideration of this vital legislation.

Below is a section-by-section description of the bill:

SECTION-BY-SECTION DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

Section 101. Title. "Product Liability Uniform Standards and Reform Act".

Section 102. Definitions.

Section 103. Preemption. This Act preempts any civil action brought against a manufacturer or product seller, on any theory, for personal injury or property damage caused by a product. Does not include loss or damage to a product or commercial loss. This Act also supersedes relevant state law to the extent that it overlaps with state law. Any issue not governed by this Act shall be governed by applicable state or federal law.

Section 104. Record Retention. A manufacturer shall retain for 25 years a copy of all studies or reports within his custody/control which assess the risks or hazards posed by the design or formulation of the product. The manufacturer shall also retain for 25 years a record of each reported incident of death, injury or illness resulting from use of the product.

Any claimant/person who is a party or who has notice that he or she may be made a party to an action under this Act shall retain all material documents and data within that person's custody/control that are relevant to the action or may lead to discovery of evidence relevant to the action.

If a party willfully disposes of a document in violation of this section, there shall be a rebuttable presumption that the facts contained in the document are adverse to the party who committed the violation. In addition, the court shall assess a civil penalty against the guilty party in the amount of \$1,000 or more and order the guilty party to pay the other party's costs, including reasonable attorney's fees incurred in proving the violation. Nonwillful violations in which no other means are available to establish the facts contained in the destroyed document will result in a rebuttable presumption against the nonwillful violator. No penalty will be assessed.

Section 105. Attorney Disclosure. An attorney contacted about rights and recovery under this Act must disclose the options available to the client, the potential recovery, time period for recovery and an estimate of attorney's fees and all other potential costs and penalties pursuant to recovery under Title II (Expedited Claims) or Title III (Civil Action).

If an attorney fails to disclose information required by this section, the client may bring a civil action for damages in the court in which an action under title II was, or could have, been brought. Recoverable damages include exemplary damages in the amount of client's economic loss.

Section 106. Service of Process. The summons and complaint shall be served as provided by applicable law.

Section 107. Admissibility of Certain Evidence. Evidence of an admission of liability, either expressly, or impliedly, is inadmissible in any other action brought under or subject to this Act.

This is a codification of the federal rules of evidence. The rationale for finding this type of evidence inadmissible is that public policy wants to encourage product improvement and voluntary payment to a claimant.

Section 108. Expert Opinion. Expert scientific or medical opinion is not sufficient evidence to establish a fact absent support in peer-reviewed scientific or medical studies.

Section 109. Subsequent Remedial Measures. Evidence of subsequent remedial measures taken by a manufacturer or product seller after the occurrence of a claimant's harm which, if taken previously, would have made the harm less likely to occur is not admissible to prove liability. (Codification of Federal Rules of Evidence)

Section 110. Product Liability Registry. Any manufacturer who is not incorporated or registered to do business under the law of the State shall contact the Secretary with the name of an appointed agent to receive service of process. The Secretary shall maintain a registry of agents and furnish the name and address of the agent to any person requesting such for the purpose of making a claim under this Act.

Within 12 months of enactment the Secretary shall establish regulations regarding

the financial responsibility of manufacturers through either insurance, guaranty, surety bond, letter of credit or any combination.

A manufacturer who fails to comply shall be liable to the U.S. for a civil penalty not to exceed \$5,000 for each day of noncompliance. The penalty will be assessed by the Secretary after the alleged violator has had the opportunity for a hearing. A person wishing to challenge the penalty may file a petition for judicial review with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia with 30 days. If the manufacturer fails to pay the penalty after the court has issued a final order, the Attorney General shall recover the amount assessed plus interest without reviewing the validity, amount and appropriateness of the penalty.

Section 111. Effective Date. This Act shall be effective on the date of its enactment. If any provision of this Act would shorten the period which a manufacturer or product seller would be exposed to liability, the claimant may submit a claim under this Act within one year after the effective date.

TITLE II. (EXPEDITED CLAIMS PROCEDURE)

Section 201. Expedited Product Liability Claims Procedure. A person who has suffered harm caused by a product (other than an employee of the product's manufacturer who suffers harm in the course of his employment) may submit an expedited claim to the manufacturer.

A person who submits a claim under Title II (expedited claims) may not seek recovery for the same harm in a civil action under Title III of this Act if the manufacturer:

- (1) makes payment of net economic loss;
- (2) declines to make full payment solely because of a dispute over the amount of the net economic loss; or
- (3) declines liability for harm or fails to respond and claimant has received a notice from the manufacturer denying liability and claimant seeks recovery under Section 208 (order enforcing claimant's right).

A person may not submit an expedited claim if they have already brought a civil action against the manufacturer under any theory/law to recover damages for the same harm.

A manufacturer who makes payment under Title II or who is found not liable may not be made a defendant in any action brought by any other party for contribution, reimbursement or indemnity for damages arising from the same harm.

Payment of an expedited claim, or a finding of nonliability will not bar an action for associated harm which is physical damage to property other than the product itself.

Section 202. Manufacturer's Liability For Net Economic Loss. A manufacturer's liability is limited to "net economic loss" under Title II. "Net economic loss" is defined as:

- (1) reasonable expenses incurred for reasonably needed and used medical and rehabilitation services;
- (2) lost income from work reduced by any income earned from substitute work actually performed or by income the claimant would have earned in available appropriate work which claimant was capable of performing but unreasonably failed to undertake. This amount shall be reduced by the amount of all Federal, State and local income taxes and any Social Security which is not considered compensation;
- (3) reasonable expenses incurred in obtaining ordinary and necessary services claimant would have performed;
- (4) lost earnings of deceased person who suffered fatal harm caused by a product

which would have been contributed to claimants entitled to receive benefits under law; and

(5) reasonable expenses incurred by claimant in preparation and submission of voluntary expedited claim including reasonable attorney's fees—minus the amount of compensation paid by any other source including a government program, employee benefit plan or insurance.

When harm occurs that may entitle a claimant to benefits which would reduce the amount of "net economic loss" to be paid by the manufacturer, the manufacturer may place in an interest-bearing escrow account that portion of the economic loss which the manufacturer anticipates the claimant will receive from other sources until claimant's right to such benefits has been determined. The total amount of compensation paid to a claimant from any other source shall be reduced by the amount of legal fees and other costs incurred by claimant in collecting the compensation.

Attorney's fees may be on a contingent basis but for purposes of calculating costs must be based on an hourly rate which should not exceed that which is considered acceptable in the community.

Section 203. Submission of an Expedited Claim. Within 120 days of the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall make available a model explanation of claimant's rights which the manufacturer will provide to a claimant within 10 days of receipt of notice of injury. An expedited claim must be accompanied by material proof of the injury and records of "net economic loss".

Toxic Harm. A person seeking to recover for toxic harm of a kind which manifests itself only many years after exposure and where it is not possible for the claimant to identify the manufacturer, may submit an expedited claim to any manufacturer of a product that is chemically indistinguishable from the product which caused the harm if the manufacturer's product was available at the time the product that caused the harm was purchased. Claimant must also provide a written explanation of efforts to identify the manufacturer of the individual product unit.

Statute of Limitations. Two years. A person under legal disability may submit a claim within 2 years after the disability ceases.

Section 204. Duty To Disclose Information. A claimant must cooperate fully with the manufacturer in the manufacturer's investigation of the claim.

Section 205. Liability for Harm. A manufacturer will be liable to a claimant under an expedited claims procedure if:

- (1) the product, when it left the manufacturer's control, was unreasonably dangerous; and
- (2) the unreasonably dangerous aspect of the product was the proximate cause of claimant's harm while the product was being used in a manner intended or reasonably anticipated by the manufacturer.

a. "Unreasonably dangerous" is established when:

- (1) the product's utility so outweighs the risk of harm that a person knowing of the risk would still be justified in placing the product in the stream of commerce; or
- (2) a. the risk of harm would be apparent to a reasonably observant person or would have been a matter of common knowledge; or
- b. if the risk of harm would not have been apparent, the manufacturer provided adequate warnings to enable a reasonable

person to avoid the risk or to make an informed decision whether to assume the risk.

(3) A product which is a drug or device which may only be administered by a licensed practitioner will not be found unreasonably dangerous if the manufacturer provided warnings in compliance with FDA requirements.

(4) If the claimant has suffered toxic harm of a kind which manifests itself only after many years of exposure, proximate cause will be presumed if:

(a) the claimant was exposed to the product at the relevant time; and

(b) the claimant's exposure to the product would "significantly increase" (incidence to an exposed population exceed the incidence in an unexposed population by 30% or more) the risk of incurring the toxic harm unless another toxic agent is more likely to have independently produced claimant's harm.

The claimant must establish by a preponderance of the evidence that, in the best available scientific opinion, exposure to a product of a certain chemical composition, in the circumstances of claimant's case, significantly increased the claimant's risk of incurring toxic harm.

Section 206. Payment or Rejection of an Expedited Claim. Within 90 days of receipt of an expedited claim a manufacturer shall determine whether it is liable for the claimed harm and notify the claimant.

If a manufacturer agrees it is liable, it shall make payment for net economic loss or enter into an agreement with claimant for another acceptable disposition of the claim.

If manufacturer determines it is not liable, it shall give the claimant written notice of rejection and a written explanation of claimant's rights to bring a civil action for an order enforcing those rights.

If a manufacturer does not contest liability but disputes the amount of the claim, the manufacturer shall pay the undisputed portion and provide claimant with an explanation of claimant's rights to initiate binding arbitration within 90 days. Arbitration will be the exclusive remedy when the dispute is over the amount of net economic loss.

Section 207. Rights Upon Denial of Full Payment. If a manufacturer disputes the amount of a claim and the claimant initiates arbitration proceedings within 90 days, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service will appoint an arbitrator to make a final determination within 60 days, of the amount owed by manufacturer. No court shall have the power to review this determination except where either party alleges fraud or misrepresentation.

Section 208. Rights Upon Denial of Liability. If a manufacturer declines liability or fails to respond to a claim, the claimant may bring a civil action enforcing the claimant's rights under this title. If the manufacturer provides claimant with a notice of rejection, the issues at trial shall be limited to those issues raised by claimant and set forth in such notice. All issues shall be tried by the court without a jury. Such action may be brought within one year of the date of submission of the claim, or within 90 days of the manufacturer's rejection of the claim, whichever is later.

If the court finds that the manufacturer is liable the court shall enter an order enforcing the claimant's rights and directing arbitration to settle any dispute over net economic loss and award reasonable attorney's fees and expenses as well as interest on the amount of claimant's net economic loss equal to 2% per month.

If the court finds there was not good cause for the manufacturer's denial of liability or failure to respond within the time required, the court shall award exemplary damages in an amount not to exceed twice the amount of net economic loss or \$10,000 whichever is greater.

If the court finds there was not good cause for claimant to file an action, the court shall require the claimant or claimant's attorney to pay all of the manufacturer's costs of investigation and defending the claim.

A person who willfully violates an enforcement order or an order of an arbitrator shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not more than \$2,000 for each day of violation, or imprisonment, not to exceed two years, or both.

Section 209. Supplemental Expedited Claim. If claimant incurs additional net economic loss arising from the same harm, and manufacturer has admitted liability, claimant may submit supplemental claims. These claims will be handled like the original claim.

Section 210. Time Limitation on Liability. Statute of Repose for all harms which are not toxic harm is 25 years from the date of delivery of the product to its first purchaser or lessee not engaged in the business of selling or leasing the product or using the product as a component in the manufacture of another product.

Section 211. Reimbursement of Manufacturer. Any manufacturer who pays an expedited claim may seek reimbursement, contribution, or indemnity on the basis of comparative responsibility within 2 years of such payment. Contribution, reimbursement or indemnity may be sought in a State court with original jurisdiction or a District Court.

Section 212. Collective Processing of Claims. Nothing in this title or in the anti-trust laws shall preclude manufacturers or product sellers from establishing and maintaining collective means of processing claims.

TITLE III (CIVIL ACTIONS)

Section 301. Civil Actions. A person may bring a civil action against a manufacturer or product seller pursuant to applicable law except where such law is superseded by this Act. By bringing a civil action, a person waives all rights to recovery under the expedited claims procedure in Title II.

Section 302. Uniform Standards of Manufacturer Liability. A manufacturer will be liable if claimant proves by a preponderance of the evidence that:

(1) a product unit manufactured by the manufacturer was a proximate cause of the harm; and

(2) a. the manufacturer was negligent in constructing, designing, providing warnings about the proper use of the product or that the product did not conform to the express warranty made by the manufacturer. (provisions for negligence conform to general negligence standards).

Section 303. Uniform Standards of Product Seller Liability. A product seller may be found liable if claimant can prove by a preponderance of the evidence that:

(1) the product unit which caused the harm was sold by the defendant; and

(2) the product seller failed to exercise reasonable care; and

(3) seller's failure to exercise care was the proximate cause of claimant's harm; or

(1) the product seller made an express warranty, independent of any express warranty made by the manufacturer; and

(2) the product failed to conform to the warranty; and

(3) the failure to conform to the warranty caused the claimant's harm.

A product seller shall be treated as a manufacturer and shall be liable for harm as if it were the manufacturer if the manufacturer is not subject to service of process or the court determines that the claimant would be unable to enforce the judgment against the manufacturer.

Section 304. Determination of Responsibility in a Product Liability Action. All claims under this Act shall be governed by principles of comparative responsibility. The court shall instruct the jury to make findings indicating the total amount of damages to each claimant for claimant's harm and the percentage of total responsibility for harm attributable to each claimant, each defendant, and to any other cause. The percentage attributable to each defendant or third-party defendant shall be determined by subtracting the percentage of responsibility attributable to the claimant and to any other cause or person who is not a party to the action from 100% and allocating the percentage remaining to the defendants according to their individual responsibility for harm.

Evidence of claimant's misuse, alteration of modification of a product shall be considered in determining claimant's responsibility for harm.

Joint and several liability shall be determined in accordance with state law except that the basis for contribution shall be each joint tortfeasor's percentage of responsibility for harm. If an amount is not collectible from one joint tortfeasor, the portion which is uncollectible shall be reallocated among other joint tortfeasors according to their percentage of responsibility.

Section 305. Relevance of Government Standards and Contracts. If a product seller proves by a preponderance of the evidence that the aspect of the product or its use which claimant cites as defective substantially complies with applicable mandatory contract specifications of a Federal, State, or local government pertaining directly to that aspect of the product or its use, the claimant shall be deemed to have failed to satisfy the proof requirements.

This section will not apply if a product identical to the product at issue is identical in all significant aspects to one which is commercially available prior to the date of the product's first sale to Federal, State, or local government.

Section 306. Uniform Standards for Offset of Worker's Compensation Benefits. The judgment shall be reduced by the sum of the amount paid as workers' compensation benefits for that harm and the present value of all workers' compensation benefits to which the employee is or would be entitled for the harm.

Section 307. Uniform Standards for Award of Punitive Damages. Punitive damages may be awarded upon establishment of clear and convincing evidence that the harm suffered was the result of conduct manifesting conscious, flagrant indifference to the safety of persons who may be harmed by a product. Punitive damages may not be awarded in the absence of a compensatory award unless death results from product use.

In determining whether punitive damages are appropriate the trier of fact shall take into account the conduct of manufacturer/seller upon learning that the product caused harm and the duration of the conduct and any concealment.

The amount of punitive damages may not exceed twice the amount of other damages awarded or \$1,000,000 whichever is greater.

Section 308. Uniform Standards of Limitation and Repose. Statute of Limitations shall be 2 years from the date the claimant discovered the harm, or in the exercise of reasonable care, should have discovered the harm. In the case of a disabled claimant, an action may commence within 2 years after the disability ceases.

The Statute of Repose will be 12 years for non-toxic harm and 25 years for toxic harm.

Section 309. Uniform Standard for Settlement Incentives. If either party offers a "reasonable" settlement which is rejected by the opposing party who is later determined to be at fault and who receives damages less than or equal to those offered in the settlement, that party will also be responsible for attorney fees and costs attributed to prolonged litigation.

Section 310. Uniform Standard for Periodic Payment of Awards. Provides that payments for future economic damages may be made periodically. If the court suspects that future economic damages may not be paid, the court may require the party responsible for payment to purchase an annuity to cover the expected cost of future payments.

Section 311. Application of Other Law. Except as otherwise provided in this act, nothing shall be construed to affect any statutory or common law rule governing recovery by a claimant or the effect of comparative responsibility upon the recovery.

ENDORSEMENT OF SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the conference report accompanying S. 124, the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments, which was adopted by the House Tuesday. I would like to take this opportunity to commend my colleagues in this Chamber, particularly the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN], who introduced the House companion bill, H.R. 1650, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, all of whom worked diligently to secure adoption of this important measure.

Despite the strides we have made in cleaning up our Nation's waterways and supplies, there remains much for us in the Congress to do. Our surface water supplies are polluted by over 700 pollutants, including synthetic organic chemicals and heavy metals. Congress has worked hard to control the spread of these contaminants to our water supplies through such measures as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and the Superfund laws. However, it would be shortsighted and fiscally irresponsible to rely on cleanup laws to maintain safe drinking water supplies. What is needed is this kind of legislation, preventing our water supplies from contamination in the first place.

While this is not a perfect bill, the conferees from both Chambers are to be commended

for producing a compromise measure with broad bipartisan support. I am pleased that the funding levels agreed to in the conference report are even higher than those originally set in H.R. 1650. These funds will be well spent, and should the President sign this legislation into law, it will save future, more costly outlays. I am also pleased to see that the Environmental Protection Agency will be required to set maximum contaminant level goals and primary drinking water regulations for 83 contaminants previously identified for regulation in 1982 and 1983. I am especially pleased that the conferees took the initiative on an issue that was not addressed originally by either the House or Senate measure. I applaud the conferees for setting restrictions on the use of lead pipes or fittings in the installation or repair of public water systems. Reducing the exposure of our drinking waters to lead is an important step in ensuring safe water supplies.

Another important feature of this bill requires the States to establish plans to protect the ground water resources which supply half of the U.S. population with drinking water. These plans would be submitted to EPA for approval, and would have to include contingency plans for locating and providing alternate drinking water supplies in the event of contamination of a water supply. Also, monitoring of class I injection wells, which are wells that inject hazardous waste below an underground drinking water source, is required to provide the earliest possible detection of fluid migration toward or into underground sources of drinking water.

We cannot afford to be negligent in protecting one of our most important natural resources. This bill is necessary to protect our Nation's drinking sources in a farsighted, cost-effective manner.

Accordingly, I urge the President to sign S. 124, the Safe Drinking Water Amendments and hope for its speedy implementation.

MAY 20, 1986, IS SENIOR
CITIZENS' DAY IN OHIO

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to inform you and my colleagues that on May 20, 1986, Senior Citizens' Day will be observed throughout the great State of Ohio. As you know, this celebration falls in the month of May, which the President has declared "Older Americans Month."

It is certainly fitting and right that we should so honor our Nation's older citizens through a specially designated month and day. Senior citizens are comprising an increasingly larger percentage of America's population—it is expected that between the years 1980 and 2000, the elderly population will grow by 27 percent. It is by now becoming common knowledge that the elderly are the fastest growing segment of the population, having grown twice as fast as the rest of the population in the last two decades.

It might be of special interest to my colleagues to know that the elderly and the near-elderly are the most likely age groups to vote. Data from the 1980 and 1982 elections demonstrate that about one-third of all voters are age 55 or older. In view of the electoral power of this group, we in Congress would be wise to pay careful attention to the special needs and interests of our older constituents. Incidentally, over half of all senior citizens in America live in just eight States, of which Ohio is one.

This increasingly large and important sector of America is deserving of the attention and honor bestowed upon it this month and on Senior Citizen's Day. Our older citizens have devoted many years of their lives to building this country, and they continue to serve it with their hands, their minds, and their hearts. I am sure I echo the sentiments of my congressional colleagues and my fellow Americans, when I say to all the older Ohioans, thank you for the beauty of your many years of sacrifice, and for your continuing contributions to American society. It is my privilege today to join with the many voices honoring American and Ohio senior citizens.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
SAMUEL J. MITCHELL

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in Congress to join me in honoring the service and dedication of Samuel J. Mitchell.

On May 21, 1986, Mr. Mitchell will be retiring from the Los Nietos School District. He has served over 28 years in the district at the Los Nietos Junior High/Middle School. As a teacher Mr. Mitchell was known for conducting a well-disciplined classroom with high expectations for his students. He completed special courses so he would be able to teach and communicate in Spanish. His fundraising efforts for the Los Nietos Teachers' Association Scholarship Fund have made it a successful program, helping students go on to college.

Mr. Mitchell is a native of Danville, PA. He graduated in 1958 from Bloomsburg State Teachers' College in Pennsylvania after serving 6 years in the Air Force. After finishing school he moved to California with his wife, Iris, where they raised their four children. His hobbies include coin collecting and model train collecting. He also has several classic and antique automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the devotion and commitment Mr. Samuel J. Mitchell has given to the students of the Los Nietos School District. I wish him all the best on his well-deserved retirement.

AMELIA BRASKIE HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, many generations of immigrants from around the world have contributed to the rich cultural diversity of our country, and I would like to take this opportunity to draw to your attention the accomplishments of one such immigrant who brought a bit of her homeland to America.

Sunday, May 4, the Tirolesi Alpini of Hazleton, PA, honored their founder, Mrs. Amelia DeFant Braskie, at their 18th annual Festa Tirolesa. It is a pleasure for me to join with this fine organization of Old World culture in commemorating Mrs. Braskie for her efforts in establishing the Tirolesi Alpini.

In 1920 and at the age of 13, Amelia DeFant left her homeland of Taio, Val di Non, region of Trento Province (then a part of Austria) for America. Amelia, her six brothers and sisters, and her parents first settled in the small mining town of Anvil Location, MI. After 2 years in Michigan, the DeFants were drawn to Hazleton, PA, where many other Tiroleans worked in the heart of the anthracite coal region. They attended the first and only Tirolean Church in the United States, Our Lady of Mount Carmel, which is still in existence and is a Pennsylvania historical site.

Amelia married a baker, Walter S. Braskie, and had two children, Jean and Eileen. In 1968 she founded the nonprofit social organization Tirolesi Alpini of Hazleton, PA, to continue the Tirolean heritage she loved. Recognized by the Autonomous Province of Trento, the Tirolesi Alpini of Hazleton is in association with the Greater Trentino in North America, and is devoted to maintaining close ties with the people of Trento, Italy. Mrs. Braskie has acted as a liaison between the Tiroleans of the Old World and the New; fluent in her native tongue, she has visited her homeland on numerous occasions and introduced the government officials of the Autonomous Province of Trento to the Tiroleans in America.

The Tirolesi Alpini of Hazleton now has 500 members and is the host to the Seventh International Tirolean-Trentine Organization Convention this July 4, 5, and 6. The 17-year history of this organization is testimony to the enduring strength of the Tirolean heritage, and exemplifies the rich diversity of our American culture.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Amelia Braskie deserves our recognition of her outstanding contribution to the cultural life of our Nation, and I am pleased to bring her accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

THE NORTHSIDE PUMPING
DIVISION EXTENSION PROJECT

HON. RICHARD STALLINGS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to authorize the construc-

tion and operation of the northside pumping division extension project in southern Idaho. The extension project shall be an addition to the existing northside pumping division which is a 77,000-acre reclamation project built in the 1950's.

The major elements of this project include the following:

First, provide irrigation service to 9,400 acres of irrigable drylands which will be sold in small tracts to add to existing farms. Part of each tract will be managed for wildlife habitat by the landowners.

Second, improve and manage for wildlife, mainly ring-necked pheasants, 5,590 acres of Federal lands scattered throughout this area.

Third, provide replacement water supplies to 810 acres of existing northside pumping division lands in a localized area with undependable ground water yields.

Fourth, provide for other minor uses of the remaining Federal lands in the area, including about 240 acres which will be sold in small parcels to square up adjacent farms in the A & B Irrigation District and a total of 840 acres which will be set aside for other irrigation district and municipal functions.

This project, Mr. Speaker, will put 17,000 acres of extension land to beneficial use. Most of these lands have already been placed under reclamation withdrawal in connection with the original northside project. These lands were not developed at the time because of funding limitations and the lands were not suitable for the gravity irrigation systems then used, but are suited for sprinkler systems now in widespread use.

I mentioned several benefits to be gained from this project. The implementation of the extension plan will eliminate the need for the costly management of these scattered tracts by both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Land Management. Existing land management conflicts between private users will also be ended and the deterioration and abuse of the tracts will be stopped with good wildlife habitat management.

Management for wildlife habitat is a key component of this project and has widespread support from the public, including local farmers, conservationists and the State fish and game department. Purchasers of these extension lands will have to agree to manage part of their new land for pheasants at their own expense and they will have to permit public hunting on these lands. These wildlife convenants will require farmers to crop their land to specific crops that can also be managed for wildlife enhancement. Only two crops—alfalfa and grain—can be planted in that area of the State to meet these wildlife covenants. If farmers were prevented from planting grain crops because they are in surplus—a policy which has recently been discussed before the this body—I am afraid this project will become rapidly infeasible.

I believe the northside pumping division extension project has all of the necessary ingredients to make it very successful and a prudent investment of Federal dollars. Water users will repay 100 percent of the irrigation construction costs and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game will repay all reimbursable wildlife enhancement costs in accordance with cost-sharing policies. More importantly to

Idaho, this project will significantly improve the economic situation on the existing farms and will restore the area so that it will once again offer some of the best pheasant hunting in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this multi-beneficial and cost-effective reclamation project. The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 4844

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the North Side Pumping Division Extension, Minidoka Project, Idaho, for irrigation, fish and wildlife, and other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF THE EXTENSION PROJECT.

For the purpose of providing irrigation, enhancement of fish and wildlife, and other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the North Side Pumping Division Extension, Minidoka Project, Idaho (hereinafter referred to as the "Extension"). The Extension project shall be an addition to the existing North Side Pumping Division, which was constructed by the Secretary pursuant to the Act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083). The principal works of the Extension shall consist of a Snake River pumping plant, wells, water distribution facilities, drainage works, transmission lines and substations, wildlife conservation measures, and related works.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF LAND.

Approximately 3,751 acres of Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management are transferred to the sole jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation for development and management as part of the Extension. The lands transferred, all in the state of Idaho, are described as follows (all range references are to the Boise base and meridian):

T. 8 S., R. 21 E., W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 27; W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 34;

T. 8 S. R. 22 E., E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 31;

T. 8 S., R. 25 E., SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 24;

T. 9 S., R. 21 E., N $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 13; E $\frac{1}{2}$ Sec. 14; W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 15; SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 18; SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 21; E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 22; N $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 23; W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 24; N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 25; NE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 26;

T. 9 S., R. 22 E., W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 7; NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 18; S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 19; N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 30.

SEC. 3. SALE OF LAND.

The Secretary is authorized to sell to eligible individuals appropriately 10,700 acres of lands subject to the following conditions:

(1) The lands shall be conveyed subject to a wildlife conservation easement reserved to the United States.

(2) The lands shall be sold for the purpose of irrigation development to owners of lands within the operating North Side Pumping Division according to terms determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. EXCHANGE OF LAND.

The Secretary is authorized to exchange small tracts of withdrawn or acquired land, in aggregate totaling approximately 300

acres, for private lands in the North Side Pumping Division required to enhance the effectiveness of the development of the Extension project.

SEC. 5. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE HEADQUARTERS.

The Secretary is authorized to reserve approximately 30 acres of land for use as an operation and maintenance headquarters site for the North Side Pumping Division and for the Extension authorized by this Act. The site shall be transferred to the A&B Irrigation District, which shall operate and maintain both the existing project and the Extension, under conditions acceptable to the Secretary. The Secretary is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the irrigation district all or part of the three Federal land areas, totaling approximately 28 acres, which are now used for operation and maintenance headquarters and related facilities for the existing project, subject to the following conditions:

(1) These lands and related facilities shall be sold in accordance with conditions acceptable to the Secretary.

(2) The proceeds shall be used by the irrigation district to develop a new operation and maintenance headquarters and related facilities at the new site.

SEC. 6. CONVEYANCE TO THE CITY OF RUPERT.

The Secretary is authorized to convey without charge by quitclaim deed to the city of Rupert, Idaho, all right, title, and interest in and to approximately 600 acres of Federal land for use as a disposal area for treated effluent from the city's wastewater treatment plant, with a provision for irrigation farming on the land using the treated effluent. Such conveyance shall be made in accordance with conditions acceptable to the Secretary and subject to the following conditions:

(1) There is reserved to the United States a wildlife conservation easement.

(2) There is reserved to the United States a reversion of title subject to the discretion of the Secretary if the land is not used for the purpose authorized in this section.

SEC. 7. LEASE AND CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO MINIDOKA COUNTY.

There is set aside approximately 210 acres of Federal land for a public golf course or other public recreational features to be constructed and operated by or for Minidoka County, State of Idaho, within 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act. During that period, the Secretary shall lease the land without charge to Minidoka County. The lease shall permit Minidoka County to sublease all or part of the land for agriculture, with the net proceeds collected by Minidoka County to be applied to the development of the golf course or other public recreational features. Upon substantial completion of the golf course or other public recreational features within 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey such land without charge by quitclaim deed to Minidoka County subject to the following conditions:

(1) A wildlife conservation easement is reserved to the United States.

(2) Title shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States if the land is not used for the purposes authorized in this section.

SEC. 8. IRRIGATION PUMPING POWER.

Power and energy required for pumping irrigation water for the Extension shall be made available by the Secretary from the

power facilities of reclamation projects in the Snake River basin at charges determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 9. POWER FOR IRRIGATION SPRINKLER PRESSURE.

Power and energy required for the provision of sprinkler irrigation pressure for the Extension shall be made available by the Secretary from the power facilities of reclamation projects in the Snake River basin at charges determined by the Secretary subject to the following conditions:

(1) The Secretary shall determine where it is cost effective to provide project sprinkler pressure as a part of the Extension.

(2) The modifications in the Extension plan shall not result in a requirement for increased Federal construction appropriations over the amount stated in this Act.

SEC. 10. CONSTRUCTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to such terms as the Secretary deems appropriate, the Secretary is authorized to contract with the A&B Irrigation District to construct certain irrigation features of the Extension, utilizing funds advanced by the purchasers of the Extension lands for construction assistance and funds appropriated for construction of the irrigation features.

SEC. 11. IRRIGATION REPAYMENT CONTRACTS.

Irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into pursuant to section 9(d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(d)). The term of such contracts shall not exceed 50 years, exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Any construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of irrigators to repay shall be charged to and returned to the reclamation fund in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200).

SEC. 12. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL WATER PROJECT RECREATION ACT.

The provision of lands, facilities, and project modifications which furnish fish and wildlife benefits in connection with the Extension project shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-12 et seq.).

SEC. 13. RATE OF INTEREST.

The rate used for computing interest during construction and, where appropriate, interest on the unpaid balance of the reimbursable costs of the Extension shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction on the Extension is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for 15 years from date of issue.

SEC. 14. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.

There is authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works and measures authorized by this Act for the fiscal year 1988 and thereafter \$15,490,000 (October 1985 prices), plus or minus such amounts as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Extension.

THE 15TH DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I recently completed tabulating the responses that I received from my 22d annual questionnaire. I want to share the thoughts of my constituents with you and the other Members of Congress.

The response from 15th District residents this year was again overwhelming. I received more than 4,000 completed surveys with responses from over 5,600 constituents. Over the years, I have found my annual survey to be an effective means to measure opinion in the 15th District. I want to take this opportunity to thank those who took the time to respond to my survey.

The questions that I asked my constituents are among the most crucial issues on which the Congress has been working in recent months. These subjects included deficit reduction, Gramm-Rudman, aid to Nicaragua, tax reform, and trade policy.

In the area of deficit reduction, 43 percent of the respondents think that the Congress should reduce military spending to cut the deficit, while 26 percent feel that the Congress should cut domestic spending. An additional 13 percent stated that revenues should be increased to cut the deficit. Eighteen percent think that the Congress should adopt a deficit-reduction package including all three options—reductions in Pentagon spending, reductions in domestic spending, and increases in revenue.

I am pleased to report to my constituents that the House approved a budget plan today that cuts next year's deficit from a projected \$174 billion to \$137 billion. House Concurrent Resolution 337, the first concurrent resolution on the budget, makes these deficit reductions in a fair and equitable manner, incorporating Pentagon cuts, domestic reductions, and minor revenue increases. The spending cuts in this budget plan are distributed evenly between domestic and Pentagon spending. This budget plan also contains \$10.7 billion in revenue increases—the same amount as that included in the Senate-passed budget and only \$4.7 billion more than the amount requested by the President. Certain high priority programs, such as education, job training, and drug enforcement, will receive modest increases from the current level.

By reducing the deficit to \$137, this budget exceeds the Gramm-Rudman deficit target of \$144 billion by \$7 billion, thus avoiding another round of cuts. Fifty-five percent of my constituents oppose the automatic, across-the-board cuts of Gramm-Rudman.

As part of his budget plan, the President requested an increase of 12 percent for Pentagon spending over the current level. Over half the survey respondents feel that Pentagon spending should be cut while an additional 34 percent said that it should be frozen at the current level. Fourteen percent think that the Congress should approve the President's re-

quest. Under the House-passed budget, outlays next year for Pentagon spending would increase by approximately \$7 billion over the current level. At the same time, this resolution would reduce Pentagon budget authority by \$1.8 billion compared to the current amount. This would reduce future years' spending while still funding the Pentagon at nearly double the 1980 level.

In the area of housing, 61 percent of my constituents stated that the Congress should not agree to the President's proposed increase in the Federal Housing Administration [FHA] mortgage insurance premium to 5 percent. The House budget does not include this premium increase. As some of my constituents may know, the FHA ran out of money at the end of April, delaying the receipt of FHA mortgages by prospective homebuyers. This funding shortfall was a result of the exploding demand for new mortgage credit resulting from falling interest rates. On April 30 the Congress approved legislation increasing the credit limits for the FHA and renewing its authority to insure loans. These FHA loans are particularly important to low and moderate income homebuyers.

In the area of foreign affairs, only 11 percent of those answering my survey think that the Congress should approve the President's requested 16 percent increase in foreign aid. The House-passed budget plan recognizes that, while spending for important domestic programs is cut or frozen, our Nation cannot afford to send additional money overseas. As a result, the House budget cuts foreign aid by 10 percent rather than increase this portion of the budget.

My constituents overwhelmingly oppose the President's request for \$100 million in assistance to the Nicaragua rebels. Over 71 percent do not think that the Congress should approve this request. The House defeated the administration's proposal on March 20 by a vote of 222-210. I opposed this request and will continue to support regional peace efforts favored by the leaders of our Central and South American allies. This \$100 million could be put to better uses helping the citizens of the 15th District.

Two-thirds of those answering my questionnaire agree that Federal funding for grants and loans to college students from low- and middle-income families should be maintained. I am pleased to report that the House budget resolution rejects the drastic cuts in these areas sought by the President. Instead, House Concurrent Resolution 337 assumes only minor cuts included in the House-passed reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

An overwhelming majority of respondents—87 percent—feel that the House-passed tax reform should be enacted into law. The prospects for ultimate enactment of comprehensive tax reform legislation improved dramatically with the approval of a tax bill by the Senate Committee on Finance early in May.

In the area of trade, only 7 percent think that the United States should continue current trade policies that have contributed to a record 1985 trade deficit of \$148.5 billion. My constituents will be pleased to know that the House will consider H.R. 4800, the Trade and International Economic Policy Reform Act of 1986, next week. As an original cosponsor of

this bill, I am hopeful that H.R. 4800 will help improve our current trade situation and move the United States away from our current failed trade policies.

Not surprisingly, my constituents identified three of the most pressing national issues as those which the Congress should be working to solve—the budget deficit, tax reform, and trade problems. As I have noted, the House has taken or will take action during the 99th Congress to address each of these issues. Of course, the ultimate success of congressional solutions depends on enactment of these bills.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents also listed the three areas on which the Federal Government should spend more money and the three on which the Government should spend less. The highest percentage—19 percent—of the respondents identified education as the area on which the Federal Government should spend more money. Education is one of the few high priority areas for which the House-passed budget increases spending.

An additional 7 percent replied that the Federal Government should allocate more resources for programs benefiting the elderly, and the same percentage of respondents identified health programs as their top priority. The House-passed budget is fair to our Nation's senior citizens. This budget plan assumes that Social Security recipients and Federal civilian and military retirees will receive a full cost-of-living adjustment [COLA]. The committee's resolution rejects the drastic cuts in Medicare and Medicaid sought by the administration. The resolution includes Medicare cuts of \$1.75 billion over 3 years but recommends that these cuts be made without any reduction in benefits or increases in out-of-pocket payments for beneficiaries. House Concurrent Resolution 337 also assumes that \$1 billion will be used to limit the skyrocketing Medicare hospital deductible.

Similarly, the areas identified by my constituents as those on which the Federal Government should spend less are also in line with the priorities of the House budget. Twenty-seven percent identified foreign aid as among the three areas where the Government should spend less. The same percentage also think the Pentagon programs should be a lower spending priority. Ten percent identified welfare as a program for which the Federal Government should spend less.

Let me close by saying that I was delighted with the number of responses to my survey. In addition, I received a number of thoughtful individual letters along with my questionnaire replies. I feel that this is an excellent learning experience for both me and my constituents, and I want to thank my constituents for responding.

IMPROVING EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF VA MEDICAL CENTERS

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill which would establish a pilot program for the improvement of the efficiency and economy of the Veterans' Administration medical centers.

The objective of this pilot program is to test whether giving maximum flexibility and authority to local managers of VA hospitals will result in more effective utilization of VA resources and management skills.

All too frequently, Mr. Speaker, in both the private and public sectors, managers must operate within constraints that do not allow sufficient opportunity or appropriate incentives to manage their resources effectively. This test program would allow a small number of hospital directors to be freed of limitations on personnel constraints and to have minimum restrictions on the use of resources provided to the medical facility.

This test program would involve five medical centers. They would be chosen by the VA in consultation with Congress and would be expected to be selected for a cross section of demographic diversity, size, and affiliation status.

During the 3 years of the pilot program, the medical centers would continue to receive operating budgets based on the most recent fiscal year actual performance by means of the VA's resource allocation model [RAM] as all medical centers do now. The target allowance would include all adjustments and each medical center would still receive additional funds for new programs, new facility activations, enhancements, program improvements, and normal reimbursable items such as terminal leave, pay raises and sharing agreements. Centralized funding would continue for programs such as stipends and contracts for medical trainees, CHAMPVA, per diem costs for State veterans homes, and payment for non-VA workload services specifically administered by clinics of jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, let me stress that there would be no changes to the eligibility for VA medical services.

Within the overall budget and following the eligibility categories, the hospitals selected for the pilot program would be exempt for the duration of the pilot from the following types of restrictions: Restrictions internal to the agency, FTEE limitations including personal services ceilings and floors, bed service and section mix restrictions, A-76 restrictions, employee travel, restrictions on the use of VAMC funds for medical center or postgraduate in-service training episodes, and other limitations, restrictions, ceilings, floors, and other constraints other than the overall availability of funds.

This pilot program is a test of whether greater management flexibility yields greater productivity. Therefore it would be evaluated

in terms of the factors currently measured by the VA's resource allocation methodology [RAM]: Workload, costs, timeliness of service, and range of services. These results would be contained in annual reports to Congress along with descriptions of VAMC operations which were facilitated or impeded by participation in the test.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we all need to look for ways to get more product out of each Federal dollar. There is the possibility that flexibility for Federal managers in the VA hospital system—who are right there where services are delivered—will help. This will cost no money, since the same allocations to the test sites will be made as if there were no test.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 4839

A bill to establish a pilot program for the improvement of the efficiency and economy of Veterans' Administration medical center

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PILOT PROGRAM ON HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Administrator shall carry out a pilot program to determine the effect of the authorities provided by this section on the efficiency and economy of the management of Veterans' Administration medical centers.

(b) **DESIGNATION OF MEDICAL CENTERS.**—The Administrator shall designate five medical centers to participate in the pilot program. The Administrator shall consult with the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives before making such designation.

(c) **MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY.**—The Director of a medical center designated under subsection (b) may waive or alter such laws and regulations applicable to the management and administration of the medical center (insofar as such laws and regulations apply to such medical center) as may be authorized by the Administrator in order to improve the efficiency and economy of such medical center.

(d) **REPORTS.**—The Administrator shall submit to Congress an annual report on the pilot program under this section.

(e) **DURATION OF PROGRAM.**—The pilot program under this section shall expire on September 30, 1989.

LEGISLATION REQUIRING DOT TO IMPOSE LABOR PROTECTIVE CONDITIONS IN AIRLINE MERGER CASES

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to require the Department of Transportation to impose labor protective conditions [LPP's] in airline merger cases to ensure that the merger is fair to employees. The legislation is needed because DOT has been refusing to follow the longstanding policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board of imposing LPP's in airline merger cases. DOT's refusal to impose LPP's in merger cases flies in the

face of a 1984 congressional directive that merger LPP's should continue to be imposed.

The failure of the Department of Transportation to follow the congressional directive on merger LPP's comes on the heels of the Department of Labor's refusal to implement the employee protection programs established by the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978. The legislation I am introducing will begin the process of forcing the Reagan administration to follow congressional intent and take regulatory action to ensure that airline employees will not be required to bear an unfair share of the costs of deregulation. The need for this legislation is evidenced by the fact that it is co-sponsored by 35 of my colleagues on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, comprising a majority of the committee's membership, and made up of Members from both sides of the aisle. I must especially note that full committee chairman, JIM HOWARD of New Jersey, and ranking minority member, GENE SNYDER of Kentucky, have both joined me in introducing this important bill.

When we deregulated the airlines in 1978, we recognized that deregulation would impose penalties on companies which were inefficiently managed or who misjudged what the public wanted. We wanted to be sure that airline employees would not be required to carry too great a portion of the burden of deregulation. For this reason, the 1978 Deregulation Act included labor protective provisions providing, first, that dislocated employees are entitled to financial benefits if there is a finding by the Civil Aeronautics Board—or, since 1985, by the Department of Transportation—that the employee lost his or her job because of deregulation. The second LPP in the 1978 law provides that dislocated airline employees have the right of first hire on other airlines.

The LPP's which we added to the Deregulation Act in 1978 have never been implemented. A primary cause of the problem has been the refusal of the Reagan administration's Department of Labor to adopt implementing regulations. Under the 1978 act, the Secretary was supposed to adopt these regulations 6 months after the bill was enacted. This deadline has not been met. Moreover, shortly after taking office, the Reagan administration withdrew LPP regulations which had been adopted by the prior administration. Since that time, the Department of Labor has never adopted regulations to implement the financial benefits of LPP. Regulations on the right-of-first-hire were not adopted until 1983 and, since then, these regulations have been tied up in litigation.

In short, airline employees have never received the protections which were an essential part of the deregulation package.

Besides providing for flexible market entry and fare setting, the Deregulation Act also facilitated the ability of airlines to merge. However, we made it clear that we did not intend that these increased economic freedoms be used to treat airline employees unfairly. In recent months it has become increasingly obvious that the Reagan administration's Department of Transportation intends to ignore the congressional intent on this issue as well.

In directing that employees be protected in the mergers, Congress was only directing a continuation of historic practice. Until it was

sunset in 1984, the Civil Aeronautics Board always imposed LPP's when it approved mergers of major and national airlines. The merger LPP's were designed to ensure that the seniority lists of the merging airlines would be integrated in a fair and equitable manner and to provide direct financial benefits to help relieve the burdens on employees who lost their jobs or suffered a reduction in wages as a result of a merger.

In 1984, when the Civil Aeronautics Board was terminated and its remaining responsibilities transferred to the Department of Transportation, Congress clearly and explicitly indicated—in the House committee report on the CAB Sunset Act—that we intended DOT to continue to impose LPP's in merger cases. Despite this directive, DOT's recent decisions in airlines mergers and similar cases indicates an unwillingness to impose LPP's.

The basic policy DOT has announced is that LPP's will not be imposed "unless it is necessary to prevent labor strife that could disrupt the national air transportation system." In a deregulated system, it is unlikely that labor strife arising out of a merger would disrupt the national air transportation system since other carriers are free to provide the services affected by a strike. Although DOT has stated that it will decide whether to impose LPP's on a case-by-case basis, in reality the standard DOT is using is highly likely to result in LPP's never being imposed.

Thus, the Reagan administration's Departments of Labor and Transportation have refused to follow existing legislation and explicit congressional directives designed to ensure that airline employees would not be required to bear an unfair share of the costs of deregulation. The legislation I am introducing today will help restore the balance which Congress thought it had already established between management freedom and employee rights.

My bill would require the Department of Transportation to impose LPP's when it approves airline mergers or similar transactions. Imposition of LPP's would be required in any case in which the transaction would tend to cause reductions in employment or adversely affect working conditions, including seniority. However, LPP's would not be imposed if DOT found that the projected cost of LPP's would outweigh the benefits. The legislation does not dictate the exact terms of the LPP's which are to be imposed, but gives DOT some discretion to tailor LPP's to fit the unique needs of each case.

Mr. Speaker, as this bill goes forward in the legislative process, I expect that we will hear from airline management that the airlines are all on their own under deregulation, and that it is only fair that the employees be treated the same way. In reality, there are definite limits to the willingness of airline management to face the risks of a merger or hostile takeover. When it comes to their own salaries and benefits, top airline management has not always been willing to leave the decisions to the marketplace.

This was clearly demonstrated at hearings we held last year on the efforts of Carl Icahn to acquire control of TWA. At those hearings we learned that when the takeover effort began, TWA's top management quickly ar-

ranged golden parachute contracts for 32 members of top management whose salaries ranged from \$150,000 to \$300,000. Most of the contracts provided that if the managers left the company they would get 1 year's severance pay. Some of the contracts even provided 3 years severance pay. The managers were given the right to severance pay if there was a change in the board of directors. For many, that right could be exercised even if the manager left TWA voluntarily.

My bill would simply afford these types of protection to airline employees below the level of top management. The merger LPP's required by my bill are far less generous than many of the TWA golden parachutes, since the merger LPP's do not provide any financial benefits for workers who leave their jobs voluntarily.

In sum, my bill would require the continuation of the merger LPP policy followed by CAB for many years, a policy which Congress has directed the Department of Transportation to continue. Requiring merger LPP's is the least we can do to reverse the administration's refusal to afford airline employees the protections which Congress intended them to have. We must do everything possible to reverse the administration's disregard of the interests and future livelihood of employees and the administration's refusal to carry out the clear legislative intent now on the books.

ADELANTE MUJER HISPANA CONFERENCE IV

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1986, I will again have the opportunity to attend in my district the Fourth Annual Adelante Mujer Hispana Conference—Onward Hispanic Women—which this year will attract approximately 700 participants, predominantly women, from all socioeconomic and educational levels in El Paso, TX; Las Cruces, NM; and Juarez, Mexico. The conference has as its goal the political, educational, social, employment, and cultural advancement of Hispanic women.

The theme of this year's conference, "Hispanas Effecting Change," reflects the contributions that Hispanic women have made to our society in educational, political, and social realms by taking an active role in the community and enhancing the awareness toward those issues that most affect us and our children.

The impact and momentum that the Adelante Mujer Hispana Conference creates each year as one of the major events in El Paso is helping to build linkages, not only among the members of the community, but also between the two border cities, El Paso and Juarez, Mexico, by inviting and encouraging the participation of our Mexican neighbors.

The Adelante Mujer Hispana Planning Committee, consisting of 18 dedicated women from the El Paso community, and headed by my district assistant, Lucy A. Calderon, has adopted the following objectives which rein-

force the concept of the conference as well as its purpose:

First, to disseminate information on professional development of Hispanas in terms of career mobility, image, entrepreneurship, leadership skills, and presentation style.

Second, to develop the role of Hispanic women in community issues.

Third, to provide a forum by which to address legal issues and consumer concerns affecting Hispanics.

Fourth, to emphasize the development of an Hispanic power base in terms of political participation, network, mentoring, and board membership.

Fifth, to provide information on financial planning—CD's, insurance, loan options, IRAs, and other investments.

Sixth, to discuss the psychology affecting Hispanic family relationships in the areas of aging, sexuality, role reversals, physical and mental health.

Seventh, to promote the importance and effect of education and employment on Hispanics.

Eighth, to promote the arts and cultural talents of the Hispanics in our community.

Hispanic women are becoming more aware of their role in the community throughout the United States, and are realizing that their talents do have a place in society. Not only are we in the midst of an awareness revolution among Hispanics in terms of the educational, social and political contributions they have to offer, but also in terms of their becoming more actively involved in enhancing the value of life that is our constitutional right.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the Hispanic women of El Paso who are effecting change and wish them continued success in their endeavors.

AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED TO TRADE BILL

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to make H.R. 4800 a bipartisan trade bill that is also responsible and consistent with our international obligations, I and several of my colleagues will offer amendments to remove the most offensive elements of the bill. The amendment that I plan to offer is described below.

To begin with, the amendment would maintain Presidential discretion to determine whether action under section 301 is in the national economic interest. The President, unlike under current law, would be required to announce alternative measures if he elected to exercise this discretionary authority.

Second, the amendment would remove from section 301 a separate ITC procedure and injury test for targeting offenses. Targeting would still be addressed, only it would be made specifically actionable under section 301. The amendment also removes, again as a separate cause of action under 301, violations of internationally recognized worker rights. Such workers' rights have not been sanctioned by the United States, yet this bill

would make other countries live up to these vaguely defined rights or face punishment by the United States.

Finally, the amendment strikes the provisions that require mandatory action in the form of quotas, surcharges or voluntary restraints against foreign countries that have trade surpluses with the United States. A somewhat watered-down version of an earlier Gephardt surcharge bill, these provisions remain GATT illegal and bad trade policy. Countries that are the targets of this provision can be expected to retaliate where we are most vulnerable, specifically in agricultural products. Ironically, with the dollar now falling, the United States should regain some of its own historic surpluses, yet this bill defines surpluses that meet a unilateral formula as a trade violation.

The amendment follows:

CRANE AMENDMENT No. 1

Amend subtitle A of title I. On page 12, line 18, strike the word "because" and all that follows thereafter through line 24, and insert in lieu thereof: ", in which case the President must announce alternative measures which may include a continuation of negotiations".

On page 13, strike lines 6 through 14; on line 18, place a period after the word "targeting" and strike all the follows through line 21 on page 14. On page 21, beginning on line 4, strike section 113.

On page 19, strike line 9 and all that follows thereafter through line 9 on page 20.

Beginning on page 37, strike section 119.

MSGR. FRANCIS J. BEEDA HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring your attention to Msgr. Francis J. Beeda, who has recently been honored for his 20 years of service to the Sacred Heart Church, North Main Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA.

A native of Scranton, PA, Monsignor Beeda is the son of Mrs. Anna Beeda and the late Roman Beeda. Monsignor Beeda was ordained in St. Peter's Basilica, Rome, Italy, on December 20, 1961 and offered his first Mass at St. Clement's Basilica, Rome.

Monsignor Beeda was assigned as assistant pastor to Sacred Heart Church in 1965. On November 24, 1974, he was appointed pastor and was elevated to his present title on March 14, 1983, by Bishop J. Carroll McCormick of the Scranton Diocese. Monsignor Beeda now serves as pastor of St. Joseph's Church in Hazelton, PA.

Mr. Speaker, Monsignor Beeda's devotion and commitment to his church and his community are an inspiration to all of us. It is with honor and great pride that I take this opportunity to honor Monsignor Beeda for his 20 years of service to the Sacred Heart Church.

NATIONAL POLICE MEMORIAL DAY

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today is National Police Memorial Day, and I would like to make a few remarks about the significance of this day for me, and all Americans. As a former sheriff, I know what it means to be a law enforcement officer, and I can appreciate the importance of the service our police officers provide.

This day is a day to reflect upon all those brave officers who have given their lives in the line of duty—the ultimate sacrifice. We pay tribute to them and we remind each other of how lucky we are to be served by such brave men and women. In paying tribute to those who gave their lives, we must also pay tribute to all police officers across America, who every day put their lives on the line.

It is a day to reflect upon how we take for granted the stalwart job that our Nation's law enforcement officers do, day in and day out. As a former sheriff I know that it is the daily routine of regular police work that also deserves recognition. While the less glamorous side of police is so often overlooked by Hollywood and the media, it should never be overlooked by Congress. We here in Congress must continue to do everything possible to assist the law enforcement community in fighting crime and in making police work as safe as possible. I am proud of the fact that after 7 long years, Congress has finally acted on passing the Law Enforcement Officers Protection Act—legislation to ban armor piercing ammunition.

But our work is far from over. Congress must continue to listen to and work with the law enforcement community to ensure that the laws of this Nation adequately reflect the very real and important needs of police officers in the field. Let the memory of those police officers who have given their lives in the line of duty inspire us to do all we can to ensure the maximum possible safety and welfare of the law enforcement community.

We live in a world that many times is filled with violence. At the present time this Nation is faced with a serious crisis—drug abuse and drug trafficking. Out in the forefront in the fight against drug abuse and the vile drug traffickers is the law enforcement community. Today is a fitting occasion to pause and thank America's policemen for their tireless efforts to combat drug abuse and the drug traffickers. Indeed, it is a day to thank them for their vital contribution to our communities and their deep commitment to the communities they serve.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to state that I am truly honored to pay tribute to America's police officers—those who have given their lives, and those who continue to serve their communities with duty, honor, courage, and devotion.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MAKING MONEY BY MAKING COINS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that not only does the U.S. Mint make coins, but it also makes money. Over the past several years a number of programs authorized by Congress have provided significant profits to the Federal Government, and there are a couple more programs that begin later this year.

In 1981, Congress authorized the George Washington Commemorative Coin Program, sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNARD] and myself. This was the first commemorative coin program authorized in almost 25 years. The legislation required that each coin sold carry a 15-percent surcharge to be used solely to reduce the national debt. The coins went on sale in 1982, and over the life of the program 7 million coins were sold, resulting in a profit of \$42 million.

In 1983 and 1984, the Mint sold congressionally authorized U.S. Olympic coins under legislation I authored. This program raised \$73 million to help train our Olympic athletes and stage the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic games. In addition to helping the Olympics, the U.S. Treasury benefited from an operational profit of \$8 million, and a profit on the use of Government-owned gold and silver of \$127 million.

Last year Congress authorized the sale of Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island commemorative coins, also under legislation I authored. The coins went on sale in October 1985, and the gold coin sold out by December. The program has already generated sales of \$124 million, including surcharges of \$32.3 million. The surcharges are used for the restoration of the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island. Sales of the remaining silver and half dollar coins remain strong and the coins have met critical acclaim.

The Mint annually sells sets of proof and uncirculated coins. When the Mint stopped selling uncirculated sets, Congress required that the sets be placed back on sale. Sales of both kinds of sets average about 5 million annually, generating an annual \$20 million profit to the Treasury.

Finally, the U.S. Gold Medallion Program, which ran from 1980 to 1985, contributed \$691 million to the Treasury from profits on the gold contained in the medallions.

In October the United States will, for the first time, begin selling gold and silver bullion coins. These coins are sure to become the world standard for bullion coins. The Director of the Mint, Donna Pope, is predicting annual sales of 4 million ounces of silver and 2.2 million ounces of gold in this program. These programs will generate significant profits which, by law enacted by this Congress, can be used only to reduce the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, these programs of the Mint not only meet the public's needs and wants for U.S. coins, but also provide significant revenues to the United States. Congress should be proud of having authorized these pro-

May 15, 1986

grams, and the Mint and its employees should be proud of successfully executing them.

WESTERN STATES PENALIZED IN DEMOCRATIC BUDGET PLAN

HON. DICK CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the architects of the House Budget Committee's budget resolution were working with a map of the United States that ends at the 100th meridian. I wouldn't blame people in the Western States telling their Eastern counterparts, "Congress always liked you best."

My Democratic colleagues have seen to it that the budget resolution takes care of Amtrak, urban development block grants, and the Appalachian Regional Commission. But the Democratic budget plan omits money for building Forest Service roads and shrinks the Bureau of Reclamation's programs by 20 percent.

The Democrats have a message for the American cattle rancher, who is already struggling with low prices and a red meat market flooded by the dairy industry's sweetheart deal called the whole-herd buy out. The Budget Committee says, "If you liked the farm bill, you'll love the budget resolution." The committee would double grazing fees, to \$2.70 a month per animal from \$1.35.

Payments to the States from mineral and timber receipts would be cut by 10 percent. Mineral royalties are income to the Federal Government, shared equally with the States from which the minerals were extracted. My Democratic colleagues are not content with a 50-50 partnership. They now want their half to be bigger.

And the House Budget Committee has a particularly special way of encouraging the domestic oil and gas industry, which has been hit so hard by the drop in international oil prices. My Democratic friends want to double the cost of filing for a Federal oil lease in the noncompetitive system, to \$150 from \$75.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the House Budget Committee's resolution because it would be so tough on the West. And I am further concerned that the committee would make deep cuts in defense spending. The committee's resolution would result in a reduction of 11 percent in defense spending over 2 years. They recommend spending \$35 billion less than the President's request and \$16 billion below what the Senate suggested.

Such a cut would significantly reduce the American defense capability. The resolution would hit hardest at defense, the single most important role of the U.S. Government, and the only function which the Federal Government alone provides.

No one believes more strongly than I do that Federal spending must be reduced. We must continue to make sacrifices. But I cannot support a spending plan that asks the West and the Department of Defense to take the cuts so that Eastern States can get by with business as usual. I would favor a spending plan that makes cuts without consulting that

abbreviated map in the Budget Committee's hearing room.

For these reasons, I cannot support the House Budget Committee's resolution.

FOOD IRRADIATION

HON. DOUGLAS H. BOSCO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced legislation to curb the expansion of the food irradiation program in this country until safety assurances about this technology have been clearly established. In light of the many unknowns about food irradiation, I believe a closer examination of the possible consequence is in order before the Federal Government sanctions its use any further.

Food irradiation refers to a preservation method in which foods are exposed to ionizing radiation to kill insects and harmful bacteria, thereby preventing spoilage and extending the shelf-life. Until recently, no irradiated food products were commercially available in the United States even though FDA had permitted the irradiation of wheat, wheat flour, and potatoes for some time. However, in the last 3 years FDA has published rules broadening the use of food irradiation to include spices, pork, fresh produce, and other foods that may become infested. Still, the prospect of utilizing this potentially hazardous technology alarms many scientists and concerned citizens, given that the safety of consuming irradiated foods is open to serious doubt, and that food irradiation will involve the transportation and handling of large quantities of highly radioactive materials.

On April 18 of this year, FDA published a final rule permitting the irradiation of fresh fruits and vegetables, and tripling the amount of radiation that may be used on dried herbs, spices, and tea. In promulgating the rule, FDA asserts that foods exposed to low levels of radiation are safe for human consumption. However, in an unusual move, FDA based its findings of safety not on toxicological testing, which is generally required to establish the safety of food additives, but rather on calculations of radiation chemistry and on the anticipated low levels of human exposure to the unique chemical products that occur in irradiated foods. Furthermore, no long-term studies have been conducted on human consumption of irradiated foods, and existing safety studies are by no means conclusive. In fact, a 1982 internal FDA audit found that of 441 studies reviewed by the agency, only 5 were adequately designed and appeared to support safety. The others were rejected for deficiencies or improprieties.

A further problem associated with food irradiation, which concerns me a great deal, involves the transportation of the radioactive isotopes involved. Millions of curies of cesium 137 or cobalt 60 would be required at just one irradiation plant. In contrast, medical centers currently utilizing radiation machines to treat cancer of the radioactive source. Yet, industry spokespersons and other proponents of food irradiation envision hundreds of food irradiation

plants around the country within 10 years. This would mean that greater quantities of radioactive materials would be transported on our Nation's freeways and railways, increasing the risk to accidents. Yet, in drafting its final rule on produce, FDA did not prepare an environmental impact statement. Instead, the agency contends that existing regulations are adequate to ensure that there will be no significant environmental impact. One would hope this assumption to hold true. However, the probability of earthquakes, plane crashes, vandalism, or any other potential mishaps that could trigger radioactive emissions into the environment, would be increased by the large number of facilities and vehicles carrying the radioactive materials. It seems to me that a thorough assessment of the existing regulatory structure is warranted before burdening the system with even greater numbers of radioactive materials.

My legislation would: Block the implementation of FDA's April 18 rule which, among other provisions, permits the irradiation of produce; block the implementation of the FDA and Food Safety and Inspection Service rules allowing for the irradiation of pork; block any further promulgation of rules expanding the use of food irradiation; and require a study to review the impact of food irradiation to human health and the environment. In addition, this bill would tighten existing FDA labeling requirements for irradiated foods. Currently, FDA does not require irradiated ingredients to be identified on the label. In other words, if irradiated potatoes are used to make potato soup, the soup can would bear no warning label to indicate this. In my view, these labeling requirements are insufficient to allow consumers to make informed choices about eating irradiated foods. My bill would extend labeling requirements to include irradiated ingredients and require a written label indicating that the food or its components has been subjected to irradiation.

Mr. Speaker, food irradiation is likely to be a dangerous and expensive process. Under the circumstances, Congress would do well to hold the program in abeyance until we have a more profound understanding of the possible consequences. I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS THE CHAPLAIN SHORTAGE IN THE ARMED FORCES

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, several religious faiths are experiencing severe shortages of military chaplains. As a result, a number of servicemen and women are unable to fully and effectively practice their faith.

I have cosponsored legislation to remedy this serious situation. H.R. 1875, the Military Chaplains Faith Balance Act, would require a more balanced representation of religious faiths among chaplains in the Armed Forces. Under the bill, the Secretary of Defense would be instructed to ask leaders of underrepre-

sented faiths to make available more clergy for assignment as chaplains in the military.

Clergy belonging to these faiths would be immediately accepted for appointment. Finally, the Secretary would be instructed to use all viable means to alleviate the faith imbalance, including the use of standby tours.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater sacrifice a citizen can make than to serve in the military and defend our Nation. We must make certain that our brave military personnel are provided the guidance, counsel, and good offices of a chaplain of their own faith.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1875, the military chaplains bill.

CONGRESSIONAL ARTS CAUCUS HONORS JOHN HOUSEMAN

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the congressional arts caucus is proud to honor an outstanding American artist whose contributions to our cultural heritage have been exceptionally varied and extensive. Over more than four decades, John Houseman has distinguished himself as a writer, producer, director, actor, and educator.

Winning an Academy Award in 1973 for his portrayal of Law Professor Kingsfield in "The Paper Chase," Mr. Houseman became nationally known, although his outstanding contributions to the arts in America began years before. Over the course of his career, he continued to revitalize the American theater by founding eight repertory companies, including the renowned Acting Company, currently appearing at the Kennedy Center.

His direction of the Broadway production "Four Saints in Three Acts"—an opera with an all-black cast—brought him much critical acclaim, as well as his appointment to head WPA's negro theatre project in 1935. His innovative work with the Federal theatre project—a program unique in the history of government and the arts—makes this congressional award particularly appropriate.

In addition to his work on Broadway and the Federal theatre project, Mr. Houseman wrote and produced numerous radio series, including H.G. Wells "The War of the Worlds" and collaborated on the screenplay that later came to be called "Citizen Kane." Over the years, his contributions to the art of filmmaking earned him 20 Academy Award nominations and 7 Oscars.

His work in television is no less remarkable. He conceived, prepared, and produced the series "The Seven Lively Arts" and served as executive producer for one of the best dramatic anthologies on television—"Playhouse 90." Together these two programs earned him three Emmy Awards—with "Playhouse 90" receiving the prestigious Peabody Award.

He has served in such varied positions as head of the theatre department at Vassar College; artistic director of the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre and Academy in Stratford, CT; and director of the drama divi-

sion of the Juilliard School. In 1973, however, his career in acting became prominent with his Oscar-winning performance in "The Paper Chase." Numerous film and television roles followed—including appearances as spokesman for companies as varied as Smith Barney, the Chrysler Corp., and McDonald's.

John Houseman has contributed so much to the American theatrical tradition. The congressional arts caucus is honored to present him its award "in recognition of outstanding achievement and dedication to the enrichment of American's cultural legacy."

NATIONAL SCIENCE WEEK

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, May 11-17 is designated as National Science Week to honor our past scientific endeavors. In my own district, the Northampton Junior High School participated in the nation-wide launch of 175,000 weather tracking balloons to mark the beginning of the second annual National Science Week. As a former scientist and a member of the Science and Technology Committee, I am fully aware of how these past achievements have provided the United States with its current high standard of living and quality of life. America's scientific leadership is recognized world-wide and America's contributions to science is evident by the 124 Nobel Prizes awarded to American scientists and engineers since the mid-1940's. These awards and the technological benefits that occurred since 1945 reflect the strong, long-term U.S. investment in science and technology by the Federal Government and its partner—industrial America.

This investment did not pay dividends in the 1st year nor in the 5th year. We are reaping the benefits today—just look at the products and possible products coming from our investment in recombinant DNA research—new drugs to fight cancer, new weather and disease-resistant plants and novel industrial products such as metal ore recovery microbes. The investment in semiconductors research in the 1940-50's now provides computers in cars to optimize performance and to reduce pollution.

But what about our future? Do we continue to follow what is apparently a "sharp investment" strategy and provide adequate support for our ongoing basic research and invest in the development of our future scientists? The National Science Foundation, under the direction of Mr. Erich Block, has taken the initiative to increase the support of the U.S. science infrastructure and to develop highly innovative programs like the Engineering Research Centers to accelerate the transition of basic research to industrial use. The Franklin Institute Science Museum and Planetarium in Philadelphia, PA, under the direction of Mr. Joel Bloom, have created a wonderfully stimulating "Hands On" science exhibit for children of the ages 8 to 14. This exhibit is now here in Congress and will travel to other science muse-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ums throughout the country. The museum also has created complete kits and instructions to assist science teachers in the elementary schools to demonstrate scientific principles in a "hands-on fun way".

It is approaches like these which will provide the United States with a continuing strong science base and enable us to compete effectively in the global marketplace and allow us to celebrate National Science Week in the future.

TRIBUTE TO SUGAR RAY LEONARD

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 17, the World Boxing Council will host a dinner for the benefit of the WBC Sports Medicine Foundation. The dinner will honor "Sugar" Ray Leonard, who is surely one of the most famous, successful and beloved sons of my own community, Prince Georges County, MD.

Since his gold medal victory at the 1976 Olympics, Ray Leonard has been a hometown hero. In fact, he is a national hero as well. He has had a distinguished professional boxing career, culminating in 1981 with his winning the unified title of Welterweight Champion of the World. It is not, however, exclusively in recognition of Ray Leonard's outstanding athletic ability and achievements that he is so admired. It is because of the grace and class with which he confronts life.

Certainly, if he wanted, Ray Leonard could retire for the rest of his life and not work another day. He has not been content to do so. Instead, he has become a respected broadcaster. Also, there is every indication that he is about to resume his professional boxing career, at least for one fight. Last but not least, Ray Leonard has committed much of his time and energy to charitable causes. The list of boards and charitable organizations in which he participates extends to several pages.

In Palmer Park, MD, Ray Leonard has been the moving force behind the boxing center which is named for him. He has donated thousands of dollars to it, and he spends countless hours there working with aspiring young boxers. These efforts are a demonstration of the best of Ray Leonard as a role model for youth who has not forgotten his roots.

Mr. Speaker, I know all of my colleagues will want to join me in sending our greetings, congratulations and best wishes to Ray Leonard, his wife Juanita and their two sons, as he is honored at the WBC Sports Medicine Foundation's "Main Event." I am sure you will agree they could not have chosen a greater champion to honor—a man who is a champion as an athlete, and, more importantly, as a human being.

POLICE MEMORIAL DAY

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, by an act of Congress, we designated this special day, May 15, "Police Memorial Day." Throughout the Nation, ceremonies are being held to honor the sacrifices of our law enforcement officers in the effort to keep the peace. To families, friends, and peers of these dedicated public servants, I extend my warmest personal sympathies and condolences.

Ironically, this body agreed on a measure just a few weeks ago that effectively weakened Federal gun-control laws. The President is expected to sign into law this measure despite the objections of our Nation's entire police force. When this law is enacted, we can be certain that it would be easier for private citizens to obtain guns. That is a frightening reality. It is argued that with gun control, the constitutional right of private citizens to bear arms is reduced. I submit to you, however, that for those private citizens that have pledged to secure peaceful communities their rights as human beings have been neglected.

On the memorial section of the American Police Hall of Fame, more than 300 California officers are listed. An average of three policemen are killed each year in the line of duty around the country. Ask ourselves, is that really a fair reward for men and women who seek nothing but peace? Are we trading off lives for the right to own arms? We speak of those killed in combat as the price for freedom. Am I to refer to the Americans we honor today as the price for peace when we, in Congress, are contributing to their deaths by minimizing gun control? I cannot in good conscience convey that message to any American or to the families of those citizens we mourn today.

I can, however, say to their families, friends, and peers that it is truly an honor for me to enjoy the protection afforded by the sacrifices of your loved ones. Every American should appreciate the difficult task that these dedicated officers perform daily. I am sure that those who have died in the line of duty would rather have lived, but somehow I feel that they valued their lives as much as they valued ours. For the forces that are performing this much needed public service today, remember the lives that depend on you—those who have passed and those who live on. With my warmest personal regards, thank you.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, today I voted on the two budget resolutions offered by the majority and minority parties in the House. Unfortunately, I could support neither. I consider both budgets undeserving of support and be-

lieve that we should begin to work on a responsible budget plan that addresses the need to reduce the deficit. I feel, however, that now that a budget has been passed, and no new alternative can come forward from the House, I should offer my own plan to reduce the deficit while meeting our pressing domestic needs and international responsibilities.

First, let me say that I cannot believe that the Democrats still want to raise taxes. Under their own projections, the cuts they made in spending would have been sufficient to meet the Gramm-Rudman targets. And they still want to raise taxes. I believe that it is time the Democrats go out and ask the average American, who they purport to represent, if they should raise taxes.

Second, the Republicans voted to increase defense spending by \$6 billion. For over 1 year now I have listened to an endless litany of horror stories about waste in the defense program. I think that the Defense Department should have its funding frozen until they learn to manage the resources they already have. We in Congress are considering reforms of the Pentagon including a reorganization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I support almost all of those reforms. Sometimes I am the lone Republican to do so. But I know that there is only one proven way to get the attention of the sleeping giant on the other side of the Potomac; we have to take away his "honey". And I think it is high time we sent the Pentagon a signal that we are going to do so.

The way to reduce the deficit is to take the \$6 billion the Republicans want to spend on the Pentagon and spend it on needed domestic programs like child nutrition, mass transit and housing. As for the \$7 billion the Democrats want to raise in taxes. Let's leave it where it belongs—in the pockets of the average American who has had to bear the burden of a wasteful government for too long.

THE 38TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in saluting the people of Israel on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of the founding of their nation. Thirty-eight years ago, at midnight, May 14-15, 1948, the fifth and sixth days of Iyar, 5708, under the Jewish calendar, the Israeli people proudly proclaimed their independence under the most adverse of conditions and the British mandate for Palestine came to an end.

From the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 A.D. and their final heroic stand against the Romans at Massada in 73 A.D. until they declared their independence on May 14, 1948, the Jewish people were without a homeland and in the diaspora—dispersed throughout the world but without the loss of their identity.

In most countries of the world during these tragic centuries, Jews were politically, socially, and physically persecuted, and prohibited from engaging in religious rituals and cultural

celebrations. This sad history of abuse culminated in the Holocaust, a systematic effort to completely erase the existence, the culture, and the history of Jewish people. Nevertheless, their spirit and determination one day to be able to seek new lives in freedom and human dignity in the land of their forefathers never wavered.

Seen in this historic context, the establishment of the State of Israel was a momentous turning point in the 2,000-year struggle by the Jewish people to achieve self-determination and religious freedom. The Jewish people, who had suffered so many centuries of persecution, and had experienced the bitterness and despair of an existence without even the most basic human rights, were able to finally declare their independence.

In 38 short years, the people of the State of Israel have turned the desert into a modern agricultural and technological state, and today, as the only democracy in the Middle East, Israel remains our trusted ally and friend. It also continues to be a beacon of hope for Jews who still are experiencing severe persecution under Communist rule.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the citizens of Israel, and their friends in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and throughout the world, in the celebration of the 38th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. May the establishment of Israel continue to be a source of encouragement and inspiration for all peoples of the world who seek to determine the course of their own destinies, and to live in freedom and dignity, without fear of persecution.

STRIVING FOR A BETTER WAY OF LIFE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this year the Gramm-Rudman budget axe will eliminate or drastically limit funding for many worthwhile domestic programs—including job training programs for the poor.

Despite the threat of Gramm-Rudman, I will continue to fight to save valuable programs like WIN and the Job Corps because without the unique opportunities they give to our Nation's young people, the cycle of poverty and hopelessness will surely continue.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to you the following article which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on April 27, 1986. The article profiles young women to refuse to be trapped in an endless web of poverty and hopelessness, but instead insist upon striving for self-reliance and a better way of life.

JOB TRAINING HELPS WELFARE RECIPIENTS TO WIN

[By Linda Lamendola]

Pearl Nath is a 35-year-old mother of three whose work history was limited to unskilled, low-paying job such as dishwasher and cashier.

But that was before she registered for a job training program because the law requires eligible welfare recipients to actively look for work or lose public assistance.

"That was about the best thing that ever happened to me," said Nath.

Last month, after going through on-the-job training as a data entry operator at the state's employment services office in Newark, she was hired at \$5 an hour in a clerical job with an East Orange manufacturing firm.

Nath is one of the 3,770 New Jerseyans who were on public assistance rolls only six months ago but are now earning their own living in private business—at an annual welfare cost savings of about \$9.9 million.

State officials are projecting \$20.3 million in welfare savings for all of 1986. Last year, welfare savings amount to \$18.8 million for an overall total of \$39.1 million during the two-year period.

The majority of persons were able to find jobs after receiving job training and counseling or other assistance through a special Work Incentive Program (WIN) administered by the state Departments of Labor and Human Services.

And for women like Nath, the program has been literally a life-saver.

Nath has been able to move from a one-room attic apartment in Newark to a spacious apartment in Livingston.

"I can't begin to tell you what a boost to my morale this has all been for me," she said.

Nath now performs a variety of duties including data entry, typing and switchboard operation. And just last week, she said, she was informed by her boss that she was "made permanent." The first thing Nath did was call the staff at the Newark WIN office to thank them again for their help and support.

While on welfare, she was receiving \$212 a month, she said.

Since she was unable to support her family, her three children had gone to live with her husband whom she divorced in 1981.

"My children do visit with me on weekends although I wish they could be with me all the time," she said.

In addition to her own three children, Nath also has been raising her young sister, Louise Bowick, now 17, who moved in after their mother died, and a nephew, Naim, eight months old. Both are still living with her.

Last year, after she could not find work, Nath applied for help from the Essex County Welfare Board. She recalled she was a little perturbed when told she would be required to register with WIN in order to continue receiving public assistance. Although every person receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) welfare benefits is required by law to register with WIN, some people—such as mothers with children under six or the sick, disabled or elderly—are exempt.

According to William Tracy, director of the Division of Employment Services in the state Department of Labor, WIN is not really a new program. "But its performance has been going up constantly" and despite a cutback in staff, "a bullish economy" has allowed the labor department to place more people in jobs, he said.

Funded by the federal government, the WIN program is aimed at persons applying for welfare under the AFDC program, he said. The program focuses on reducing welfare costs by providing recipients with the help to find good jobs and become independent tax-paying citizens.

"We provide them with the employment, training and social services necessary to find

jobs so they are able to end their dependence on welfare benefits," said Tracy.

Eligible recipients are referred for job training through 13 state employment offices.

"Pearl Nath is one of our best success stories," said Sally Hall, supervising WIN specialist at the state labor department.

"In spite of Pearl's eagerness, her lack of experience proved to be a barrier to employment," noted Hall.

The WIN staff, impressed by her enthusiasm and on learning that she had high school typing, suggested some work experience would improve her chances to land a job in the business world.

Nath was assigned to the state's employment services and WIN office in Newark. After a few months, she became experienced enough to be placed with the East Orange firm.

"It was frightening at first to have to go to work especially after you have been raising kids and staying at home so much," Nath said. "Having to get up early to go to the job and then come home and care for the kids is double work and when you have to do it along with your housework, it's a triple job. But I love it. I feel great and having a job has boosted my morale."

Nath is not the only WIN success.

Andrianna Rodriguez is another "shining star" of the WIN program. A 44-year-old mother of one child, she had been on and off welfare since 1975.

In 1983, after being laid off from her clerical job, she was unable to find work and applied for public welfare.

Rodriguez said she was required to register for WIN and in July 1984 was enrolled in a federally funded clerical training course in Newark run by the New Jersey Department of Civil Service, after being placed there by the labor counselor.

Now Rodriguez works as teacher's aid at the school where she was once a student.

"School officials were so impressed by her motivation, attitude and ability she was hired as a teacher's assistant," said Jane Egee, her supervisor. "She is working with us now."

"She contributes so much to our trainees. Having been there herself, she is a source of inspiration to them," Egee added.

For Rodriguez, life now is "just great."

"When you are on welfare, you feel very low about yourself. But you have to do it because without help, you can't pay your rent or buy food for your children.

"But now, I have a reason to get up every day and come to work and try to look as nice as I can. I try to encourage the girls in our class who are trying to learn some office skills, to tell them they can do it, too."

There are thousands of other success stories. Like Linda Countryman, for example.

A 37-year-old mother of three, her only recent work experience was one year as a sewing machine operator in 1984. She hurt her back and was no longer able to continue on the job.

In July 1984, she registered for the WIN program when she applied for welfare. With the assistance of a WIN counselor, she was enrolled in a one-year course at Burlington County Community College, attending half time and working at a state employment service office where she did data entry work part time.

In January 1985, she decided she wanted to start working immediately although she could have remained in school longer. WIN paid for repairs to her car so she could commute to Trenton where she started working as clerk typist at \$8,900.

She is now a senior clerk typist earning \$11,900 a year and no longer on welfare.

David Phillips, chief of the Bureau of Manpower Training Programs in the state labor department, said the average cost for training a welfare recipient is about \$920. In some cases, he said, where an eligible client requires more training and assistance, costs could run about \$2,100 for each trainee.

But state officials see the costs as a one-time expenditure.

TRIBUTE TO CLINGAN JACKSON

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to honor Mr. Clingan Jackson, for whom a testimonial dinner will be held on May 25, 1986, in Youngstown, OH. Clingan Jackson has given Ohio's Mahoning Valley a lifetime of service, and he is not done yet. In fact, even as he is honored, he continues to contribute to our community; funds raised from his testimonial dinner will go toward the establishment of a scholarship in political science at Youngstown State University.

Clingan Jackson, father of two, has led an illustrious 44-year career in journalism. He began in 1929, doing general reporting for the Youngstown Vindicator. He became the Vindicator's political editor in 1936. In 1958, he covered his own campaign for Governor of Ohio. His election night story prompted the head of Scripps-Howard to proclaim, "By God, he is a newspaperman." Over the years, Clingan Jackson has interviewed many Ohio and national legislators, including Presidents Herbert Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford, and Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Jackson has also led an active political life. He began as Lowellville Village councilman, served as State representative and State senator, and chaired the Ohio Highway Construction Council.

In addition to a successful and active journalistic and political career, Clingan Jackson found time to serve others through civic and religious volunteer activities. He was an elder and trustee of his church, where he taught adult education classes for many years. He was president of the Downtown Kiwanis in 1956, and was a member of the Ohio Civil Rights Commission for over 22 years. He is currently a member of the Youngstown Charter Review Commission and chairman of the senior citizens' multipurpose center. He was honored by his community in 1956 with a special "Jackson" edition of the Vindicator—truly a testament to the special character and contribution of this fine individual.

I am delighted that so many have chosen to honor Clingan Jackson on May 25, and am pleased to add my voice to those who thank and congratulate him. His many years of success and accomplishment, of tireless commitment to duty and to others, is an example to us all.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. DAN COATS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, the month of May is traditionally observed as Older Americans Month. It is a time when we can recognize the valuable contributions senior citizens make to our country. We should not only focus on older Americans' accomplishments, but also commit, as a nation, to protect their rights and enhance their opportunities.

Seniors comprise the fastest growing population segment in this country; 1 in 9 Americans is at least 65, and, as more and more Americans live longer and play prominent roles in our society, I believe we should take special note of their concerns. Age creates no philosophical barriers and draws no philosophical lines, unless we choose to construct those barriers and draw those lines. We should learn from the matured wisdom that older Americans possess because that is a valuable resource we cannot afford to ignore.

In the Fourth District of Indiana, and I believe it is true across the country, our seniors are particularly aware of the issues being considered by the Federal Government. Many older citizens have taken an active role in expressing their opinions about Federal Government activities, and thus, continue to make constructive contributions to the debate on a wide range of issues.

Working with the senior community has been one of my most rewarding jobs as a Federal Representative and I will continue to protect the well-being of our older population. Our seniors are entitled to be singled out and I applaud the month of May as Older Americans Month.

INTRODUCTION OF DUMPING BILL

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the predatory pricing policies of our foreign competitors threaten American jobs in basic U.S. industries such as machine tools, ball-bearings, and semiconductors and we have not been able to stop them.

We have ample evidence that foreign firms are "dumping" goods in the U.S. market, in violation of U.S. laws and international agreements, by lowering prices below their actual cost of production and fair market value in order to gain U.S. market share and force U.S. producers out of business.

Current remedies, which include the application of off-setting duties, have proven ineffective in deterring foreign firms from such vicious price-cutting behavior. Proposed remedies in the new trade bill, which include allowing U.S. companies to seek damages in Federal district court, will not halt this practice

either because they do not address the market share problem.

Only the denial of that which foreign companies seek most, U.S. market share, will prevent dumping. Therefore, today I am proposing perhaps the toughest dumping penalties ever because I have seen the damage done by unrestrained foreign predators who target our basic industries and undermine employment and security in this country.

I believe we need legislation on the books which would give our trade officials the power to impose temporary exclusion of all goods from the U.S. market which are produced by any person or firm found to be engaged in predatory pricing in violation of the U.S. anti-dumping code. And under my bill, incorrigible repeat offenders could be excluded permanently.

It would work like this: If you're caught once, you cannot import for at least 90 days and perhaps on up to a year, depending on your previous record. If you're caught a second time, you cannot import for at least 1 year and possibly up to 5 years. Three strikes and you're out for at least 5 years, or if the Secretary of Commerce determines that you demonstrate no respect for our laws, he or she may bar you permanently.

I believe we need to get to the root problem of this particular unfair trading problem by convincing other nations that our market is not easy pickings for their companies which undercut prices as a matter of policy. When they see that the price of getting caught is not worth the risk, then they will stop.

After the fanfare of the omnibus trade bill subsidies, I would ask my colleagues to investigate this issue further and consider my approach as the only effective way to stop foreign dumping.

THE UPJOHN COMPANY AND KALAMAZOO: 100 YEARS TO- GETHER

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, in the basement of a downtown building in Kalamazoo, MI, four brothers named Upjohn—William, Henry, James, and Frederick, all of them doctors—started a small company called the Upjohn Pill and Granule Co. The new firm was a small operation. Its first product list included 186 pill formulas compounded from 56 drugs and botanicals. Its sales in its first year of operation amounted to \$50,000.

From those modest beginnings, the company steadily grew. It opened its first branch sales office in New York City 4 years later. It began the 20th century by expanding and becoming a manufacturer of general pharmaceuticals, changing its name in 1902 to the Upjohn Co.

In their wildest dreams, the four brothers who started business in 1886 could not have imagined what their company would become. Today, as the Upjohn Co. celebrates its centennial, it is a worldwide enterprise with annual sales surpassing \$2 billion. It has re-

search, manufacturing, sales, and distribution facilities in more than 200 locations in about 150 nations.

But although the company has grown enormously in its century of existence and operates in the four corners of the world, its home base has always been and remains in Kalamazoo. The city of Kalamazoo is in my district, so I'm very well aware of what Upjohn has meant there.

First, Upjohn is the largest employer in Kalamazoo County. Its direct financial impact on the area in 1984 was more than \$441 million annually, and it employs almost 8,000 people in the county.

The Upjohn Co. has made its mark on the community in other ways. Long before the phrase "corporate social responsibility" became fashionable, the Upjohn Co. and the Upjohn family were busy making magnificent contributions to the area. Today, you can drive through Kalamazoo and see the Upjohn contributions all around you—a civic auditorium, a beautiful park, an art center, a municipal golf course, a philanthropic foundation, an internationally respected think tank, and much more.

It is apt that in its centennial year, the Upjohn Co. is giving a gift to the children of Kalamazoo. It is the Kalamazoo Area Mathematics and Science Center, which will offer youngsters in the 9th through 12th grades the accelerated math and science instruction not now available to them at individual schools. This gift, worth some \$2 million, will operate under the direction of the Kalamazoo Board of Education and is scheduled to begin operation this fall.

I've had the privilege of knowing and working with countless Upjohn executives and employees on all sorts of civic projects. These days, the company is ably led by three gentlemen: R.T. Parfet, Jr., the chairman of the board and chief executive officer; Theodore Cooper, M.D., the vice chairman of the board; and Lawrence C. Hoff, the company's president. Upjohn has been blessed with other executives who provided first-rate leadership and contributed much to the community, such as Dr. Gifford Upjohn and Donald Gilmore. Everyone in Kalamazoo knows all these names.

Kalamazoo is a more prosperous, more attractive, more cultivated, and more pleasant place to live because of the Upjohn Co. They have done very well indeed in their first 100 years. I wish them just as much success in their next 100 years.

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND L. HERRING

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to pay tribute to a dear friend of mine, Raymond L. Herring, who died at age 72 on April 30 at Western Baptist Hospital in his hometown of Paducah.

Raymond Herring owned and operated the R.L. Herring Insurance Agency in Paducah for many years.

Through the years I have served as a Kentucky State senator and in the U.S. House of

Representatives, I have frequently visited with the Paducah Lions Club. This club is a highly respected organization with a large membership and is the sponsor each year of Paducah's most successful telethon—raising money for handicapped children—over WPSD-TV, the NBC station in Paducah.

I am to speak next Tuesday at the weekly meeting of the Paducah Lions Club. However, it won't be the same without Raymond Herring being present. Raymond was the tail twister for the Lions in Paducah. He could and would fine the members for being late to their noon luncheon meeting, or for not wearing their club pin, or whatever. This was and is a fundraising method for miscellaneous purposes. Raymond Herring, as club tail twister, even fined a few club guests ever so often. I was one of his favorite targets for humorous ridicule and for fines.

The club members would await my response in kind to Raymond Herring. I can remember looking forward to the Paducah Lions Club meetings just so I could find out Raymond Herring's latest humor regarding club members and guests.

Obviously, it is easy to tell that I was very fond of Raymond Herring.

A veteran of World War II, serving in the U.S. Marine Corps, Mr. Herring was a son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Herring. He was a member of Fountain Avenue United Methodist Church; Paducah Masonic Lodge No. 127; Rizpah Shrine Temple of Madisonville; Paducah Lions Club; Paducah Elks Club, and all Masonic bodies.

Mr. Herring is survived by his wife, Mrs. Kathleen Herring; a daughter, Kathy Moore of Paducah; two stepdaughters, Harriet Kay Rudy Blades of Newburgh, IN, and Beverly Rudy Baker of Madrid, Spain; three sisters, Ruth Madrey of Mayfield, Birdie Thomas of Paducah, and Lela Harris of Chicago, and six grandchildren.

My wife Carol and I extend to Kathleen and the family our sympathy and prayers at this difficult time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today, May 15, 1986, I was unable to stay for the final votes on the concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1987. I had a previous commitment which I could not cancel and had to leave before the floor debate was completed. I would have voted "yea" for the Latta substitute to House Concurrent Resolution 337, and "no" on final passage of this resolution which was Chairman GRAY's version. The Latta budget contained the necessary spending reductions, adequate defense numbers which would not cause cuts in military personnel, as would the chairman's budget, and most importantly it did not call for an unconscionable and unexplained increase in taxes.

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION STEPS UP ASSISTANCE TO DE- VELOPING WORLD

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article about the Rockefeller Foundation which recently appeared in the New York Times. The Rockefeller Foundation recently embarked upon a new strategy in its efforts to promote economic and social development around the globe. I was privileged to learn about this new direction at a luncheon I attended recently hosted by Dr. Richard Lyman, president of the foundation. I believe that we in the Congress should take a cue from Dr. Lyman and his associates as to how to turn dollars and cents into meaningful programs.

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1986]

ROCKEFELLER UNIT DOUBLES ITS THIRD-
WORLD AID

(By Kathleen Teltsch)

The Rockefeller Foundation, adopting an expanded global program, will spend up to \$300 million in the next five years to promote economic and social development in third-world countries. The sum is double the money the private philanthropy provided for overseas aid in the last five years.

Dr. Richard W. Lyman, the foundation president, said Thursday that the new strategy sought to insure that benefits from recent research in agriculture, health and population control reached those in greatest need, "the poor and vulnerable."

More than a billion people live in poverty, he said, and the sub-Saharan countries will get particular attention because their problems are the most intractable.

"We believe that by promoting the equitable and effective use of science and technology to benefit hitherto excluded groups, we will capitalize on our own strengths and complement the efforts of others," Dr. Lyman said at a news conference.

The increase in funding puts the Rockefeller Foundation roughly on a level with the overseas aid supplied by the Ford Foundation, which is spending \$60 million annually for developing countries, and well ahead of the Carnegie Corporation and the Kellogg Foundation, which each spend about \$10 million on foreign assistance, according to Tom Fox, vice president of the Council on Foundations.

By comparison, Federal assistance to third-world countries through the Agency for International Development will total \$600 million this year.

Dr. Lyman and Rockefeller officials, in outlining the program, said recent biotechnological progress could have an effect in the poorer countries comparable with the gains accomplished in the 1950's when the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations promoted new high-yield grains that brought about a "green revolution."

He added that the foundation wanted to call attention to the needs of the third-world countries, which could otherwise be overlooked as the powerful industrial countries focus mainly on the competition for trade advantages.

The foundation does not contemplate expansion of its overseas staff, he said, but

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rather expects to work extensively with local government authorities and also to tap the talent of the many younger scientists and technicians it has trained over the years under fellowship programs. There are about 2,000 working abroad in 50 countries.

Although the specific outlays of the new global program have not been decided, foundation officials provided these initial examples of activities:

The Rockefeller program will focus on insuring that research gains, such as recent advances made in vaccine research against malaria and other diseases, are made available to "end users." It will also support availability to China and African countries of an improved contraceptive, Norplant, a hormone capsule implanted under the skin that provides protection for five years.

The foundation will improve links between existing international agricultural research centers and the domestic agricultural programs of African countries and through them "to reach the African farmer."

New research will be initiated to determine how women in developing countries influence and are affected by the expansion of industry or modernization of agriculture. A related project will examine how imported technologies can be blended with familiar local ones.

The foundation will examine research, education and technology-management policies in some third world countries to determine how they affect developmental efforts. It will also support work in technology transfer and examine license and patent practices that could obstruct the transfer.

Dr. Kenneth Prewitt, vice president of the foundation who will have overall direction of the program, said he regarded it as a long-term undertaking. "We see it as a starting point to insure the benefits of science reach those most in need—the farmer, the mother trying to control pregnancy and the parent trying to protect a child against disease," he said.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues a copy of a resolution recently approved by the Ohio House of Representatives and the Ohio Senate commemorating the 100th anniversary of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. The NARUC, in partnership with the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Ohio have provided very valuable services for all utilities customers and I commend this forthcoming anniversary celebration to the attention of my colleagues.

A RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS

Whereas, The members of the Senate of the 116th General Assembly of Ohio are pleased to congratulate the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners on the occasion of its Centennial; and

May 15, 1986

Whereas, The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners was established at the Interstate Commerce Commission convention in March 1889. Since that time, the Association has been a major force in the study and discussion of regulatory subjects and in the uniformity in state regulation. In honor of the contributions the Association has made to this country over the past one hundred years, the Commissioners Emeritus have requested the issuance of a postage stamp commemorating this auspicious anniversary; and

Whereas, Composed of nearly one hundred state, federal, and international agencies, including the Economic Regulatory Commission, the United States Department of Labor, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners provides state agencies with technical assistance and research, which promote uniform regulatory practices nationwide; and

Whereas, The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners has not only offered much-needed information and services to state and federal agencies over the past century, but it has also been a vital instrument for community improvement by standardizing the regulation of transportation and utility industries; therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Senate of the 116th General Assembly of Ohio, in adopting this Resolution, congratulate the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners on the occasion of its One Hundredth Anniversary and salute the members of the regulatory commissions, past and present, as outstanding citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this Resolution to the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners and to the news media of Ohio.

LEGISLATION TO REFORM FEDERAL ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING PROGRAM

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am joining the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. UDALL, in introducing legislation which seeks to reform the manner in which the Federal onshore oil and gas leasing program is conducted.

The chairman's legislation represents an appropriate vehicle for the consideration of onshore oil and gas leasing reform. During this Congress, the Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources has conducted two oversight hearings on the program and it has become clear that the Bureau of Land Management is at this time uncertain about the ability of its noncompetitive leasing system to withstand fraud and abuse as well as its ability to determine whether tracts of land should be made available for leasing under the competitive or noncompetitive system.

This uncertainty calls into question the suitability of the current program to meet the energy needs of the Nation. Not only is the energy potential of public lands being threatened under such an environment, but also the

public's right to receive a fair rate of return from the development of federally owned oil and gas resources.

The Department of the Interior's onshore oil and gas leasing program, as authorized by the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, consists of a competitive and noncompetitive system. For lands within a known geological structure (KGS) of a producing oil and gas field, a competitive leasing procedure is used. For lands outside of a KGS, the simultaneous leasing system, commonly referred to as the lottery, is used as is over-the-counter trading.

While this system is fine in theory, the BLM has encountered problems in making KGS determinations. Further, the lottery system due to allegations of abuse has been suspended a number of times. Because of these controversies, the orderly development of the Nation's onshore oil and gas potential is rapidly being undermined.

As one who strongly believes in the absolute necessity of increased reliance upon domestic energy resources, the current threat to the integrity of the Federal onshore oil and gas leasing program is of great concern. Consider the fact that by the end of fiscal year 1985, there were 22,718 producing oil and gas leases under BLM supervision. During that fiscal year 175 million barrels of oil and 1062 billion cubic feet of gas was produced from Federal leases.

As I have stated, Chairman UDALL's legislation appears to represent a good starting point for discussions on reform legislation. While I have some reservations with certain provisions in the bill, the proposal provides for a compromise between those seeking the total elimination of the noncompetitive leasing system and those who believe some semblance of this type of leasing is necessary to preserve competition and promote exploration. It certainly would not be in the public interest to reduce the participation of the independent oil and gas sector in the Federal leasing program.

I look forward to working closely with the gentleman from Arizona on this matter, as well as with others who have expressed an interest in the issues we are seeking to address.

**VFW ESSAY WINNER LEO
PROCESO JACOBO**

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit into the RECORD an essay by Leo Proceso Jacobo, the Maryland winner of the Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program.

The program was started 38 years ago with the endorsement of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Association of Secondary Schools Principals. Sponsorship was provided by the National Association of Broadcasters, Electronic Industries Association and State Association of Broadcasters.

Starting in 1958-59, the program was conducted in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars with the broadcasters still serv-

ing as sponsors. In 1961-62, the VFW assumed sole sponsorship responsibility.

This past year more than 250,000 students participated, receiving awards amounting to over \$675,000. During the past 24 years of VFW sponsorship, over 5 million students have participated and awards totaling more than \$3 million have been given to winners at all levels.

Mr. Jacobo is a senior at Calvert Hall College High School in Baltimore. I congratulate him on winning the scholarship, and I wish him well in his college career and his future endeavors in the study of law.

NEW HORIZONS FOR AMERICA'S YOUTH

There, in the distance, is a foreboding horizon, a challenge to reach unsurpassed excellence, or unthinkable destruction.

"You will be America's best generation, or you will be her last!"

These demanding, apocalyptic words of Dr. Harold Bosley, former Dean of the Duke University Divinity School, challenge America's youth to be her best generation or her last. An America in need of direction, a planet in need of genuine peace, a new horizon, beckoning all young Americans to be the best.

How are we, the youth of America, to be the best? I firmly believe we can be the best by personally committing ourselves to genuine honesty and hard work.

Honesty is a virtue, which must be learned and lived at our young age. It is essential in our quest for the horizon, the quest to be the best. Along the way, we must not fall into the tempting traps dishonesty lays for us. All too often, youthful inexperience leaves us vulnerable to dishonest actions. We are all tempted to lie . . . "Everybody's doing it" . . . or to cheat . . . "just this once" . . . or to steal . . . "I'm not really hurting anyone". And little by little dishonesty takes over.

Honesty produces trust. Trust is the key to society's success, the success of any relationship, be it parent-child, student-teacher, husband-wife, or even President and Premier. Unless behavior is honest there can be no success, no trust, and the horizon of America's youth will slowly recede.

Honesty also demands hard work. What our nation is today has been achieved by hard work. The American dream, of attaining one's goals, through hard work, must inspire my generation. We must understand, dreams can only be realized by our personal efforts, and will not be handed to us on a silver platter. America's youth, needed to learn the lesson of the idealistic young man, who, at the age of 20, believed he could change the world. At age 40, he realized that changing the world was impossible, so he would judge life a success if he could only change 20 other people. Finally, at age 60, he realized, that life would have been successful if he had changed just one person—himself. Now, and not at age 60, my generation, should understand we cannot change our troubled world unless we first change ourselves. Our individual honesty and hard work will eventually improve society, and will guide us to the horizon.

The challenge to be the "best or the last" is a demanding one, in a world where missiles are far more accurately guided than men. Our honesty and hard work will lead us to appreciate, the prophetic words of Pope Paul VI: "If you want peace, work for justice!"

We must overcome apathy and settle for nothing less than injustice. Murders, rob-

beries, frightened citizens hiding behind locked doors occur because we tolerate injustice—injustice victimizing the innocent, and the helpless. We Americans stand by witnessing, but not acting. To be the best, America's youth must no longer be spectators of injustice, rather, we must be participants in establishing justice. With justice achieved in America, we can strive for global peace.

To be "the best and not the last", is frightening, challenging, demanding. Our efforts to be the best will determine whether we will even "be". With undying devotion, undiminishing determination to honesty, hard work and justice, America's youth will be able to overcome the fears and the obstacles.

There, in the distance, is a beacon of hope or a foreshadowing of doom, a New Horizon for America's Youth, to be the best and not the last. We cannot, we must not . . . fail.

**IN PRAISE OF NONPROFIT
ORGANIZATIONS**

HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, nonprofit organizations are the embodiment of the American volunteer spirit. I want to take this opportunity to applaud some of the good work done in my home State of Georgia—and in each of my colleague's home States—by nonprofit organizations that strive to meet humanitarian and public service goals.

Over the past several years, our Government has been shifting much of the social and humanitarian responsibilities to the private sector. Efforts to decrease the Federal deficit have placed new burdens and new strains on even the most established and well-recognized nonprofit organizations. While the Government has whittled away at many programs, we have hoped that the private sector would continue to provide those services to our elderly, our sick, our needy, our disadvantaged—the folks not able to provide for themselves.

In the President's last State of the Union address, he praised the "mighty river of good works" that contributed \$74 billion in voluntary giving last year alone. We've come to rely on that river for so many services to our friends and families that it's difficult to imagine the state of our Union without those organizations working with us.

Well, whether knowingly or not—whether aware of the implications or not—a lot of folks are talking about damming up that river.

Organizations must raise funds and communicate with volunteers if they are to make any impact in their missions. They rely on the mails to solicit those donations and help coordinate that volunteer spirit. If we close off their access to the mails—dam up that river—the consequences may be more dramatic than we anticipate.

I don't think any of us would willingly thwart the efforts of groups that are trying to pick up the slack created by government cuts. But third-class nonprofit postal rates have shot up over 45 percent since December. Where are

nonprofits going to make up those costs? They may have to reduce services, or start charging fees for services.

Imagine the Red Cross, for example. Because of that rash of disasters that we experienced last year, they spent a record \$48 million in 6 months and ended up \$14 million in the red as a result. They have had to redouble their efforts to raise funds if they are to be ready when needed again—and they surely will be. The Red Cross is turning to direct mail to raise funds and bolster the donor base for their reserve disaster fund. I will not be responsible for hiking the already soaring non-profit postal rates on folks like the Red Cross or forcing them to charge user fees to victims of disaster.

Now, more than ever, Congress must reaffirm our support for the works of the private sector. Without such support, religious, philanthropic, educational, scientific, cultural, fraternal, veterans, and labor groups will be forced into making hard decisions that can only decrease private sector activity.

Remembering that figure of \$74 billion in voluntary giving last year—consider that the revenue forgone payment to the Postal Services was reduced to only \$716 million last year. This year, the Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers tells me that we need \$833 million to fund the program for fiscal year 1987—and that includes \$58 million for a prior year adjustment. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that this constitutes a wise investment in behalf of our entire society.

I ask my colleagues to remember the good works done by the nonprofit private sector in their communities and salute that work by providing them with the tools to continue to do the job. Let us show our support for their efforts by providing adequate funding for revenue forgone.

PROFAMILY COALITION URGES HOUSE AND SENATE TO MAINTAIN PROFAMILY ASPECTS OF TAX REFORM

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding aspects of the recent debate over tax reform has been the opportunity to bring some fairness to the Tax Code in its treatment of the American family. I am gratified that the other body has included a \$2,000 exemption for every family member as a part of its tax reform proposal, and I am hopeful that the final legislation will maintain this crucial component of tax reform, without which the proposal would fall far short of its goals of fairness to the American family. The success we have been able to attain in making this the centerpiece, along with lower rates on labor and capital, of tax reform is largely attributable to the work of a broad-based coalition of profamily groups that have made this their No. 1 priority. The impact that this coalition has had on the concept of tax reform is evident in the Republican Platform of 1984, which called for the increase of the personal exemption to a

minimum of \$2,000, and indexing to prevent further erosion. This was included as a key component of tax reform by President Reagan in his proposals, and was a major part of my tax reform bill, the Kemp-Kasten proposal. I applaud the efforts of this coalition, led by such outstanding Americans as Dr. James Dobson, Phyllis Shafly, Tim and Beverly LaHaye, Connie Marshner, and many others who are committed to making the American family the cornerstone of our public policy efforts. I commend the following statement to my colleagues.

THE COMMITTEE FOR FAIRNESS TO FAMILIES

The Committee for Fairness to Families applauds the pro-family features of the Senate Finance Committee's tax bill. Worthy of special praise is the Committee's decision to approve the \$2,000 personal exemption and significantly reduce tax rates for virtually all families.

We urge the full Senate to approve this legislation promptly. We commend the Finance Committee for its unanimous action and urge its conferees to insist upon these important pro-family measures in negotiations with the House.

Alive and Free.
American Association of Christian Schools.
American Christian Task Force.
American Coalition for Traditional Values.
Americans Against Abortion.
Christian Impact.
Citizens for America.
Coalitions for America.
Contact America.
Couple to Couple League.
Dick Dingman and Associates.
Eagle Forum.
Family Protection Lobby.
Free the Eagle.
Intercorps for America.
Leadership Action.
LIMIT Taxes Committee.
Maranatha Christian Churches.
National Association of Evangelicals.
National Association of Pro America.
National Federation of Church Schools.
National Integrity Forum.
National Pro-Family Coalition.
Plain Facts.
Public Advocate of the United States.
Union of Orthodox Rabbis.
United Families of America.
American Conservative Union.
Concerned Women for America.
Great Commission International.

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the fifth annual "National Peace Officers' Memorial Day" service in Senate park. It was a truly moving experience, and a tribute worthy of the supreme sacrifice made by the 154 law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 1985.

National Peace Officers' Memorial Day is an event that dates back to 1963. Always on May 15, this occasion has long been marked by local ceremonies across the country, but only

since 1982 has a national ceremony been conducted in Washington, DC.

Sponsored by the Ladies Auxiliary of the Fraternal Order of Police, the event has grown considerably in size and impact. This year there were more than 300 police survivors in attendance, and more than 3,000 law enforcement officials from police forces across the United States.

Many persons deserve credit for the tremendous success and growth of the National Peace Officers' Memorial Day Service; most notably, Suzie Sawyer, president of the Fraternal Order of Police Ladies Auxiliary. Suzie, who is the wife of a police officer, has been untiring in her work on behalf of law enforcement causes. It was Suzie, and then-President Trudy Chapman who were the driving forces behind the first national memorial service in 1982; and it was Suzie, who 2 years ago spearheaded the formation of Concerns of Police Survivors, the country's first national law enforcement survivors group. Suzie also serves as the executive director of COPS, and in that position has provided invaluable assistance and support to the surviving families of our fallen police heroes. She is to be commended for her compassion and her devotion.

Others deserving of special recognition for their contributions to this year's memorial service include Dick Boyd, president of the Fraternal Order of Police; Yolanda Cline, president of COPS; and Tom Singleton of Take One Productions, Inc., a retired police officer who produced the 1986 Memorial Service.

But, I concur with the sponsors of this year's memorial service, who stated that:

The people who allow this effort to be successful are the surviving families of our fallen heroes. They have been forced to accept law enforcement's ultimate demand. They have traveled to Washington this year representing over 60 of the 154 officers we honored here today. The tribute today was even more meaningful to these surviving family members when they saw the numbers of officers who have traveled from all across the United States to assist in making law enforcement's statement to the Nation: "Our fallen law enforcement officers have not died in vain and their human sacrifice will never be forgotten."

Mr. Speaker, let me say that no matter how impressive the National Peace Officers Memorial Day ceremony has become, our Nation's fallen heroes and their survivors deserve something more, and I am proud to be a part of such an effort. In October 1984, President Reagan signed into law legislation I authorized along with Senator CLAIRBORNE PELL to authorize the construction of a National Law Enforcement Heroes Memorial in Washington, DC. As chairman of that organization, I am pleased to report that major strides are being made toward the construction of that memorial. It will be built exclusively by private funds, and the fundraising effort is already under way, as is the selection process for a suitable site and design. Most importantly, our Nation's leading national law enforcement organizations have all expressed a total commitment to the cause. Seated on the board of directors of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Inc., are the Concerns of Police

Survivors, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the Fraternal Order of Police Ladies Auxiliary, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the International Union of Police Associations/AFL-CIO, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Black Police Association, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Sheriffs Association, the National Troopers Coalition, the Police Executive Research Forum, the Police Foundation, and the United Federation of Police. Senator PELL is the honorary chairman and Tammy Kennedy Wolfe is a valued adviser to the organization.

Much work still lies ahead, but one thing is certain—when all is said and done, our Nation will finally have an impressive day-to-day reminder of the supreme sacrifice that more than 1,500 law enforcement officers have made in the last 10 years alone. It will also serve as a much-needed reminder of the need to better protect those who continue to protect us.

Mr. Speaker, as one who served as a law enforcement officer for 23 years, I am deeply honored to pay a personal tribute to the 154 law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 1985. This "Roll Call of Heroes—1985" lists those courageous men and women by the State they served:

ROLL CALL OF HEROES—1985

ALABAMA

Robert E. Armstrong, Charles W. Biles, Larry D. Cawyer, Louie E. Cosby, Issac D. Hamby, John W. Mann, Myron J. Massey, Julius N. Schulte, and James C. Vines.

ALASKA

Ignatius J. Charlie.

ARIZONA

Lester L. Haynie and Darrell D. McCloud.

ARKANSAS

John Fallis and Phillip G. Ostermann.

CALIFORNIA

George L. Arthur, Henry I. Bunch, Jose Cisneros, Monty L. Conley, David W. Copleman, Dean J. Esquibel, Joe R. Landin, Michael O. Lewis, Raymond E. Miller, Thomas E. Riggs, Clifford E. Sanchez, and Thomas C. Williams.

COLORADO

Thomas J. Dietzman, Jr.

CONNECTICUT

Jeffrey G. Casner.

FLORIDA

John C. Baxter, Jr., James A. Bevis, Lindell J. Gibbons, Harold L. Holgerger, and John R. Melendez.

GEORGIA

Walter N. Coleman, George E. Goare, John T. King III, and Philip B. Mathis.

HAWAII

David W. Parker.

IDAHO

James E. Simono.

ILLINOIS

Kenneth R. Dawson, Wayne G. King, Michael W. Ridges, and Raymond H. Topolewski.

IOWA

Daniel M. McPherren, Sr., and Charles G. Whitney.

KANSAS

Deanna S. Rose.

KENTUCKY

William R. Burns and Roy H. Mardis III.

LOUISIANA

Joseph W. Jarreau, Sr., and Richard A. Kent III.

MARYLAND

Vincent J. Adolfo and Richard J. Lear.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alain Y.J. Beauregard, Marvin C. Bland, Mary M. Foley, Michael J. Schiavina, Thomas E. Strunk, and Harold L. Vitale.

MICHIGAN

Roy L. Graham, Paul L. Hutchins, Donald E. Rice, and Dean A. Whitehead.

MINNESOTA

John T. Scanlon.

MISSISSIPPI

John R. Klem III and Alma B. Waters.

MISSOURI

Johnnie C. Corbin, James M. Froemsdorf, and Jimmie E. Linegar.

MONTANA

Timothy J. Sullivan.

NEW JERSEY

William H. Fordham, Albert J. Mallen, Sr., Abigail J. Powlett, Nathaniel H. Taylor, and Robert E. Walls.

NEW MEXICO

Manuel Olivas.

NEW YORK

Oronzo L. Cellamare, Thomas F. Hudson, Brian Rooney, and Gary R. Stymiloski.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert L. Coggins, Giles A. Harmon, Johnny W. Wagner, Timothy W. Whittington, and Raymond E. Worley.

OHIO

Jody S. Dye and David H. Massel.

OKLAHOMA

James A. Bradley, Lowry D. Durlington, Darrell E. James, William R. Stewart, and Gary L. Ward.

OREGON

Gerald G. Chirrick, Virgile D. Knight, Jr., and Ronald H. Terwilliger.

PENNSYLVANIA

John J. Brown, Robert M. Daiss, Gary W. Fisher, Charles P. O'Hanlon, Donald W. Parker, Jr., Thomas J. Trench, and Ronald J. Turek.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Vaughn E. Kee, Valdon O. Keith, Bruce K. Smalls, and Robert A. Way.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Oren S. Hindman, Leslie P. Hollers, and Matthew V. Schofield.

TEXAS

Adrian S. Aguilar, John P. Frisco, Thomas L. Harris, Charles D. Heinrich, G. Darrell Honea, Billy E. Jones, William P. Kohllepel III, James D. Mitchell, Jr., David E. Nelson, Reginald F. Norwood, David W. Roberts, Manuel Salcido, Jr., Joseph R. Steenbergen, Walter L. Terry, Lewis W. Wahl, Kevin J. Williams, and Robert D. Wright.

VIRGINIA

H. Glenn Lawson, Jr., Barry L. Pendry, and Leo Whitt.

WASHINGTON

Dale E. Eggers, Richard D. Glass, Craig A. Nollmeyer, and Glenda D. Thomas.

WEST VIRGINIA

Clemmie L. Curtis, J. David Harris, and John R. Tucker.

WISCONSIN

Rosario J. Collura, Leonard R. Lesnieski, and Gerald W. Mork.

WYOMING

Robert A. Van Alyne, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robin L. Ahrens, Enrique Salazar Camarena, Larry N. Carwell, and Joseph M. Cournoyer.

MARIANA ISLANDS

Manuel A. Aquino.

PUERTO RICO

Eladio Aponte Rivera, Pedro A. Burgos Lacourt, Francisco Diaz Melendez, Herminio Lopez Pilar, Homero Ortiz Martinez, Pablo Ramirez Morales, Ramon Luis Reyes Rosa, Isidro Rodriguez Monclova, Osvaldo Santiago Oliver, and Carlos A. Velazquez Colon.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH E. KELLER

HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate one of the country's foremost transportation officials, Joseph E. Keller, who was recently named counsel emeritus for the Private Carrier Conference. Mr. Keller, during his long and distinguished career, helped to redefine the Nation's transportation systems. In fact, he was largely responsible for creating the definition of what constitutes a private carrier.

The largest of 11 conferences affiliated with the American Trucking Associations, the Private Carrier Conference is the national trade association that represents manufacturers, distributors, shippers, and receivers who operate motor trucks as an extension of their primary business endeavors. Private carriers are the dominant sector of the trucking industry today, hauling nearly 60 percent of the Nation's intercity truck ton-mileage and operating 6 million vehicles.

Before being named counsel emeritus, Mr. Keller had served as general counsel of the Private Carrier Conference since its reactivation after World War II—during which he served as a major in the U.S. Army.

A graduate of the University of Dayton, where he received his law degrees in 1930, he practiced law in Dayton before coming to Washington, DC, as an attorney for the Federal Communications Commission. He has practiced law in Washington for the past 50 years, first with the firm of Dow, Lohnes & Albertson and then with his own firm, Keller & Heckman which he founded in 1962.

Mr. Keller has served as a law instructor and has contributed numerous articles to leading law reviews and served as legal editor for the Private Carrier, a motor carrier trade journal.

Throughout his career, Joe Keller has been a leader with a solid track record. So today

we recognize and pay tribute to a capable and effective representative of the Nation's motor carrier industry.

I wish him every continued success.

A TRIBUTE TO A MOST DISTINGUISHED EDUCATOR: MR. BOB WHITE

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute today to a good friend and most distinguished individual. Mr. Robert Buell White has dedicated the past 37 years to teaching music at my alma mater, T.L. Handy High School in Bay City, MI. I am honored to recognize Mr. White as he prepares to enter retirement.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues some important information about Bob White and his dedication to the Bay City community. Bob White is a lifelong resident of Bay City, attending Handy High's current rival school, Bay City Central, Bay City Junior College and graduating from the University of Michigan in 1949. His education was interrupted by military duty with the U.S. Navy from 1942 to 1945.

Bob White began his teaching career at T.L. Handy High School in 1949, and has remained an institution within an institution. He is well respected by staff and students alike. Bob's teaching career was not simply a job, but a way of life for him. He has been deeply involved with not only high school aged students, but children of grade school and middle school age as well. Bob has directed musical productions such as the "Merry-Go-Round" Summer Band Programs, and has acted as city wide music coordinator, planning programs and curriculums for music students of all ages. Throughout all of his dedication of time and diligent hard work with his students, Bob found the time to act as a liaison between the Bay County Board of Education and the music teachers throughout the area.

Bob also has taken time out of his busy schedule to plan, organize and execute band trips to Washington, DC in order to give the students of Handy High School the perhaps once in a lifetime opportunity of performing at our Nation's Capital.

My personal contact with Bob White over the years has been highlighted by allowing me the honor of marching with the Handy High School Marching Band in the annual St. Patrick's Day parade in Bay City.

Mr. Robert B. White has left his everlasting mark on the students and citizens of Bay City, and current and future generations of people living in that area will be able to reap the benefits of his efforts. I ask my colleagues to join with me today in honoring a fine individual, and wish him every continued success in his retirement.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEWARK'S INTERNATIONAL YOUTH ORGANIZATION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, I had the honor to attend the opening ceremony of the International Youth Organization's Little League and its Westside Women's Softball League, held at Westside Park in Newark.

Each of the two IYO leagues consists of 6 teams of 25 players. Drawing participants from all neighborhoods of Newark, these leagues contribute to a positive sense of the urban community. They give parents and children constructive recreational time together, promoting family life and offering young people an opportunity to enrich themselves and display their talents.

The International Youth Organization is a community-based organization founded by James Wallace and his wife, Carolyn. Mr. Wallace, now the organization's executive director and commissioner, was a special police officer in the early 1970's when he saw the need to provide a positive outlet for Newark's youth. So he established the IYO to meet the needs of the local community. Starting with 13 youngsters, the organization now involves 700 people and employs 3 certified teachers.

Besides the IYO's Little League and Women's softball, the organization runs a variety of after-school programs, including computer literacy classes, tutoring sessions, junior and senior youth leadership groups, and other recreational activities.

This is the type of initiative that enhances the life of our city, and I applaud the Wallaces and all the softball and Little League players for their community spirit. I was proud to be a part of their opening day ceremonies.

IN SUPPORT OF THE TALKING LEAVES JOB CORPS CENTER

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago the Department of Labor announced plans to close six Job Corps centers across the country as a result of the March 1986 Gramm-Rudman budget cut. One of the six centers targeted for closing is the Talking Leaves Job Corps Center in Tahlequah, OK.

It's no secret that I oppose Gramm-Rudman. The Labor Department's plan to close these Job Corps centers is a prime example of why Gramm-Rudman is bad law. Computer statistics cannot measure the full human importance of these centers—to the community or to the participant.

Job Corps provides the last chance for many disadvantaged young people to learn the skills to become productive citizens. It's like the saying, "Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day; teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime." Job Corps partici-

May 15, 1986

pants improve their basic education and learn job skills that will last a lifetime.

This is not the time to close down programs aimed at teaching job skills. In Cherokee County, where Talking Leaves is located, unemployment is currently 11 percent. March figures place the average unemployment rate among counties in my district at 10.9 percent. The Talking Leaves Job Corps Center directly serves more than 400 young people each year. Almost half are from Oklahoma.

This is not the time to close down programs aimed at improving educational skills. For the fiscal year 1984-85, the dropout rate for the State of Oklahoma was 9,000 students. The dropout rate in that time period for the 14 counties that make up Cherokee Nation was more than 4,500 students—half the State total.

Oklahoma is facing some tough economic times. Because of the drop in energy prices and the crisis in agriculture, Oklahoma has had to cut the State budget by 14.7 percent this year. Oklahoma may lose Federal matching funds for Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Medicaid.

The Talking Leaves Job Corps Center contributes to the local community. The Center has a \$2.5 million annual budget and 80 employees. The Corpsmembers participate in community projects such as local cleanups, a Christmas food drive for needy families, and volunteer work at the Cherokee Nation Youth Shelter. Vocational Skills Training Corpsmembers have assisted in many projects such as building an airport in Stilwell, OK, and constructing 5 miles of road near a local lake.

The Department of Labor must make cuts to achieve the 4.3-percent budget cut mandated under Gramm-Rudman. Along with 74 colleagues, I signed a letter to Chairman NATCHER of the Subcommittee on Labor—HHS—Education Appropriations asking him to urge Secretary Brock to authorize using Job Corps construction funds to maintain current slot levels and keep all Job Corps Centers open.

People can look at the big picture. Computers cannot. When we take the human facts into account, it is clearly a bad decision to close this program that teaches young people skills that will lift them from the welfare cycle and make them tax-paying citizens.

POLICE MEMORIAL DAY

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, today is Police Memorial Day, a day we have set aside to pay tribute to law enforcement officers who have died in the line of duty. It is the most solemn of our celebrations during National Police Week.

Law enforcement officers have earned a special place of honor in our society. Working long hours and often under difficult conditions, they protect our lives, our families, and our property. That work is often thankless; it is always dangerous. This week, we honor police officers around the country who willingly make that commitment to our safety. Today, we re-

member those who have lost their lives in that cause.

I would like to pay special tribute to three officers from my district who have been killed in recent years while serving their communities—Patrolman David Tapscott, of the Springfield Police Department; Officer William Simmons, of the Sangamon County Sheriff's Department; and Patrolman Osmer Milbert, of the Quincy Police Department. Their families should know our gratitude and appreciation.

According to the Justice Department, 72 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty in 1984—an average of more than one each week. This is a disgracefully large number. Unfortunately, our steps to protect law enforcement officers have been erratic. In this session, Congress banned the manufacture and importation of armor-piercing ammunition; the so-called "cop-killer" bullets. But many Members also ignored police warnings and approved a bill which will weaken gun control laws and make it easier for criminals to get handguns.

The National Association of Chiefs of Police pays tribute to colleagues killed in action by inscribing their names at the American Police Hall of Fame in North Port, FL. It is a long list. By working to protect police officers, and by remembering, we can keep that list from growing longer.

ANDREI SAKHAROV DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.J. Res. 596, legislation that would authorize the President to proclaim May 21, 1986 as "National Andrei Sakharov Day". Coming as it does in the midst of the Bern Human Contacts meeting in Switzerland, it is of importance that the House continue to recognize the infinite contributions Dr. Sakharov has made to world peace and to human rights.

Confined to the closed city of Gorky, Dr. Sakharov and his wife Yelena Bonner, maintained their courage stoically throughout repeated government reprisals against them. This former Nobel Peace Prize winner and founding member of the Moscow Helsinki Monitoring Group has not kept silent in the face of official repression; rather, he has been kept silent. After repeated hunger strikes, Dr. Sakharov was able to negotiate his wife's release to the West for urgently needed medical attention. Dr. Bonner is now recuperating after several surgeries, and is expected to depart in a few weeks.

But on May 21, 1986, Dr. Andrei Sakharov will celebrate his 65th birthday. He will do so without the comfort of friends and relatives. His companions will be KGB agents. Letting him know that we stand with him in his struggle for freedom and human rights is as important as signaling to the Soviet Union our deep and abiding respect for Dr. Sakharov and his efforts.

Dr. Bonner visited Washington recently, and many of us were privileged of having the op-

portunity to meet her. Her courage in the face of this adversity is also to be admired, as is her devotion to her husband.

Mr. Speaker, the Sakharovs are a unique couple who maintain their commitment to our common respect for fundamental human freedoms, in spite of the fact that they suffer physically and emotionally from doing so. In his attempt to ensure that the Soviet Union adheres to and respects the precepts of the Helsinki Final Act and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, Andrei Sakharov is tortured with forcefeedings, kept under continuous surveillance and is isolated in a remote part of the country. He cannot speak for himself at this time, and it is, therefore, our duty to speak for him. By proclaiming May 21 as "National Andrei Sakharov Day" we can assure that at the very least, the American people will commemorate this day by focusing special attention on Dr. Sakharov and on the concepts which he espouses, and which the Soviets would so obviously prefer that we forget.

LEGISLATION TO PREVENT WASTE OF U.S. ENERGY RESOURCES

HON. PHILIP R. SHARP

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to help prevent a waste of U.S. energy resources and taxpayers' money.

On Monday the General Accounting Office confirmed that the Department of Energy last month sold Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve oil for as little as \$6.30 per barrel while the average price in the region at that time was over \$13 per barrel. About 82,000 barrels per day will be sold from now until October 1 at a cost to the taxpayers of as much as \$400,000 per day.

To compound the error, the Department was paying \$12.60 per barrel to buy oil for the strategic petroleum reserve at the same time it was selling oil from the Naval Petroleum Reserve for \$6.30.

This unfortunate situation occurred as a result of a sales process designed for stable or rising oil prices which was not modified during the recent rapid decline in prices. A contributing factor is a statutory requirement that DOE produce oil from the Naval Petroleum Reserve at the maximum efficient rate. DOE is not allowed to reduce production, and they have no ability to store these quantities of oil near the Elk Hills field in California.

In a letter to Secretary of Energy Herrington, I have summarized the problem and asked that he modify DOE bidding procedures to prevent further sales at these outrageously low prices. I ask that a copy of my letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I have also spoken with him, and he expressed his intention to correct the problem quickly.

The legislation that I am introducing today addresses the statutory requirement for maximum production rates. This bill would allow for

production below maximum at the discretion of the administration, taking into account oil market conditions, energy security, and revenue implications. It also provides that DOE cannot sell the oil below:

First, 90 percent of the prevailing market price, or

Second, the price of oil being purchased for the strategic petroleum reserve, adjusted for cost of transportation and oil quality.

These adjustments will not cause a shutting in of NPR production and will still allow California refiners to acquire Elk Hills oil at a fair price. Nonetheless, these reductions will prevent Uncle Sam from being a price predator and helping drive independent producers out of business. It will also prevent the scandalous situation of the Government selling oil with one hand at 50 cents on the dollar while with the other hand paying full price to purchase oil.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOSSIL AND SYNTHETIC FUELS, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,

Washington, DC, May 12, 1986.

Hon. JOHN S. HERRINGTON, Secretary, Department of Energy, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The General Accounting Office has completed a preliminary investigation (copy enclosed) which documents the sale of Naval Petroleum Reserve oil at prices as low as \$6.30 per barrel, prices which constitute giving away a valuable public asset at less than its value. At the same time, oil was being purchased for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at \$12.60 per barrel delivered.

I urge you to find a way to stop this unilateral price war. It appears to be due to a bidding process that establishes sale prices for six-month contracts in reference to posted prices, which have become very volatile. It involves the government in a risky game more suitable to speculators.

The process appears to have been designed for stable oil prices but then left on automatic pilot when the market got turbulent. Shareholders would demand a change if a private company's oil were being sold so cheaply; the taxpayers deserve no less.

Coupled with the Inspector General's recent determination that the Department may be producing oil from the NPR at a rate above the Maximum Efficient Rate [MER] and may therefore be reducing ultimate recovery, this leads to the conclusion that current NPR policy and implementation is shortchanging the taxpayer both today and in the future.

Excess NPR production in a glutted oil market also adds to the current difficulties of oil producing regions of the country.

In 1984, prior to the President's recommendation to continue producing oil from the reserve at MER, I recommended that the law be changed to allow the President a choice other than maximum or minimum production rates. This would add to national energy and economic security in the future by providing for less rapid depletion of the Reserve, but it would also allow the flexibility to consider and balance market conditions, revenue needs, strategic concerns, domestic producers' interests, and California's refiners' needs. The Department of Defense concurred with this recommendation. The Department of Energy disagreed, however, and the President went along with your rec-

ommendation to continue maximum production.

In light of the GAO's evidence and the Inspector General's report, please provide your recommendations on how such results can be avoided in the future.

With both posted and spot prices for California sweet crude far above DOE's lowest sale price, is DOE in violation of the NPR Act of 1976 requiring sales to be "not less than the prevailing local market price of comparable petroleum?"

How can bidding procedures that may have been appropriate in the past be changed in light of today's rapidly changing oil market?

Should the law provide you with the flexibility to alter production rates in order to avoid fire-sale prices?

In the absence of a law giving you flexibility to slow the rate of production, can you avoid selling the oil too cheaply by purchasing it for the SPR?

Can a floor be established under NPR sales prices, perhaps similar to the one we agreed upon for the SPR test sale?

With oil prices so low and the oil economy in trouble, do you still believe it makes sense for the U.S. to sell as much oil as possible from the NPR and to cease purchasing oil for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve?

In addition to raising concerns about the Department's stewardship of this valuable national asset, these sales will undoubtedly have an impact on the proposed sale of the entire NPR. I am sure you can understand that Congress and the public are likely to be skeptical about the Department's ability to obtain a fair market price for a multi-billion dollar oil field if it currently undersells its product.

I would appreciate having your explanation and response to my questions by May 23, 1986.

Sincerely,

PHILIP R. SHARP,
Chairman.

NATIONAL NURSING HOME WEEK

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, by proclamation, the President designated the second week in May as "National Nursing Home Week." The theme, "Celebrate Lifetime Achievements" was chosen in recognition of the significant contributions and accomplishments of those who reside in nursing homes.

By the end of 1985, an estimated 1.5 million older persons lived in nursing homes, representing about 5 percent of the elderly population. While only a small proportion will live in a nursing home at any given time, about 20 percent will spend some time in a nursing home each year. In 1985, about 2 percent of the elderly population who were 65 to 74 were in a nursing home; for those 85 and over, that figure had increased to about 16 percent.

Of those who are institutionalized, nearly 75 percent are without a spouse as compared to the noninstitutionalized population, where just over 40 percent are without a spouse. Additionally, nursing home patients tend to have health problems that significantly restrict their ability to care for themselves. These two facts

suggest that in the absence of a spouse or other family member who can provide help with activities of daily living, the likelihood of institutionalization is increased.

For many older persons facing institutional care, the presence of the family care giver is the crucial factor. In many cases, the care giver is the spouse or daughter. In fact, the family has been shown to provide between 80 and 90 percent of the medically related care, personal care, household maintenance, transportation, and shopping needed by older persons. The important contribution of the care giver has not been adequately recognized, and for this reason, I have introduced legislation that would set aside the week beginning November 24—which includes Thanksgiving Day—as "National Family Care Givers Week". With this commemorative week, we can begin to recognize the contribution of the care giver in maintaining frail and disabled family members in the home.

Nursing home residents have been shown to be disproportionately very old, female, and currently unmarried. As a consequence, they are likely to be the most vulnerable and the most isolated from the community. For that reason, like any institutionalized population, it is essential to assure their continued self-determination and the protection of their rights.

We know that the institutionalization of any population can lead to abuses, but for the elderly, where there are few checks from outside, it is particularly important to establish a mechanism for the protection of rights. On February 27, I introduced H.R. 4279, the Long-Term Care Patients Rights Act of 1986 for the explicit purpose of assuring, by statute, that the rights of residents of long-term care facilities are not violated or abridged. In addition to enumerating rights and designating remedies and penalties for the violation of rights, H.R. 4279 would prohibit discrimination against Medicaid recipients, would establish an explicit private right of action, would establish a statewide, uniform reporting system for complaints and violations, and would strengthen the long-term care Ombudsman Program. Thirty-five of my colleagues have joined me in supporting this bill.

I am particularly pleased to salute those who live in the 15,000 nursing homes across the country. I believe that we should honor and pay tribute to those who reside in nursing homes, not only for their past contributions, but also for their potential for continuing and future contributions.

TERRORISM IN IRAN

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, today I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the tremendous suffering that continues to plague the people of Iran. At a time when terrorism is on the minds of so many Americans, I think it is important to remember the terror to which the Khomeini regime is subjecting its own people.

The Iranians who have managed to escape the brutal conditions in their country have told

their horrifying stories of torture, mutilation, and political repression. Amnesty International and other human rights groups have documented thousands and thousands of tortures and executions. Women are beaten or killed for minor "violations" of Khomeini's dress code. Executions are estimated at 50,000 people—many of those schoolteachers, students, and even infants. It is believed that there are over 140,000 political prisoners held in Iran.

Although it is an unpleasant matter to face the atrocities of the Khomeini regime, we must face them. We must not forget that every day there are men, women, and children in Iran being terrorized by the policies of war and torture. As representatives of a nation that champions human rights, it is our responsibility to speak out against this oppression.

The Iranian people were brutalized at the hands of the Shah, and they continue to suffer under the inhuman policies of Khomeini. Let us work together to build a policy that will announce to Khomeini and the world that we are committed to the encouragement of peace, freedom, and human rights everywhere.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WOMEN'S CIVIC IMPROVEMENT CLUB

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to draw your attention to the 50th anniversary of the Women's Civic Improvement Club. This fine organization was founded in 1936 by 10 dedicated women who felt the desperate need for housing and other services for minority women after World War I. Recognizing this need, these women began to provide housing and employment assistance to black and other minority women. It has since enjoyed a rich history spanning over five decades as one of the oldest black women's organizations in the Sacramento, CA area.

While the Women's Civic Improvement Club has provided outstanding leadership and assistance to the community over the past 50 years, it continues to provide a number of services and programs for the community. The club conducts valuable programs at its community center which are geared toward the development of responsible citizens and especially designed to assist disadvantaged individuals. For example, the center's programs include special assistance for senior citizens, nutrition programs for low-income individuals, Head Start, summer camp, and employment and counseling programs for teenagers.

The Women's Civic Improvement Club and the women who serve in it deserve special recognition for their important accomplishments over the past 50 years. I commend this fine organization and the dedicated women who have contributed their time and effort in service to the club and the community over the past 50 years. I look forward to a bright future and continued success for the Women's Civic Improvement League.

FCC COMPUTER III DECISION A GOOD START—NOW IT'S UP TO CONGRESS

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, today the FCC adopted a report and order on its Third Computer Inquiry (CI-III). The Commission's decision will allow AT&T and the Bell Operating Co.'s to provide so-called enhanced services such as voice storage, health, and utility monitoring services and other computer enhanced applications to residential and business customers through the telephone network after certain consumer and competitive safeguards have been met.

I applaud the Commission for its actions today. This is a forward-looking, proconsumer, protechnology decision.

The CI-III decision, however, only removes one of the roadblocks to consumers receiving computer enhanced services from their telephone companies. Another still exists—the AT&T consent decree.

We've reached the point that many of us in Congress have feared. A kind of regulatory double-speak now exists where one entity of the U.S. Government says the telephone companies can offer certain services and another says no.

I'm concerned that many of the services that could be offered as a result of today's FCC's decision may never reach consumers. This is because there is a great deal of overlap between what the FCC considers "enhanced services" and what the consent decree defines as "information services." As long as the consent decree's ban on information services exists, the Bell telephone companies will be caught in a regulatory whip-saw and consumers will be denied certain services and the benefits of competition.

The FCC's decision today makes it even more imperative that Congress enact H.R. 3800 this year. This bill would eliminate the regulatory ambiguity that now exists by allowing the FCC—the principal telecommunications regulatory body in this country—as opposed to a Federal judge, to determine what circumstances information services should be offered.

Toward this end, it is my hope that the chairman of the Telecommunications Subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado—Mr. WIRTH—will schedule a markup on H.R. 3800 at an early date so that the full House will be able to consider the issue during this Congress.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHILDREN'S HOME OF DETROIT

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 150th anniversary of the

Children's Home of Detroit, a voluntary, non-profit, nonsectarian, residential treatment center for emotionally, educationally, and socially troubled children ages 6 to 18.

The Children's Home of Detroit, originally called the Ladies' Orphan Association, was founded in May 1836 by concerned women to "care for helpless and homeless little children." Since that time, this admirable organization has expanded and prevailed through several changes in name and location. Through it all, the home has maintained its purpose of providing loving care for troubled children in our community.

Today, situated on a 13-acre campus in Grosse Pointe Woods, the Children's Home of Detroit provides a peaceful setting with six cottages, a medical center, recreation facilities, and a school. Included among the many services provided are casework, special education, psychiatric and medical services, recreation, summer camp, and service to families.

I have had the privilege of visiting this fine institution. I have met the dedicated staff and seen their true devotion to these children. They prepare the children by guiding, educating and loving them until they are prepared to return to their families, homes and communities, and ultimately become responsible and contributing members of our community.

I am proud to serve the Children's Home of Detroit in my district in Michigan. I would like my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly deserving and worthy institution on the occasion of its 150th anniversary.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, because there has been concern expressed by some Members of the House of Representatives about the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I feel compelled to add a couple of thoughts of my own.

The organization is chaired by former Congressman James Roosevelt. It has been an honor and a pleasure for me to know Mr. Roosevelt for several years. By every measure of his life and his ideals, he qualifies as a great American. I have the utmost respect for him.

As the eldest son of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, I am sure he feels a special concern for programs that help the elderly and for Social Security, because of his father's role in opening these opportunities to a better life to millions of Americans.

In addition, I would like to remark that I have found the information from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare to be informative and helpful. Older citizens in my area are very worried about these programs—they depend on them—it is vital to their health and lifestyle that they continue. As much as I and other Members of Congress strive to keep our constituents in-

formed, publications such as this are extremely helpful in letting people know the situation, and communicating with their Congress.

I rise in praise of Mr. Roosevelt and his organization and I believe the organization should be commenced for its high degree of expertise and professionalism which it has brought to the senior citizens lobby.

TRIBUTE TO CARLA COHEN

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this moment to commend a constituent, Carla Cohen, editor and publisher of the Franklin Square and Floral Park Bulletin, who has demonstrated remarkable determination in balancing her rewarding career as a businesswoman and newspaper editor while raising two outstanding children. She is renowned as a fair, honest, and accurate chronicler of the life of these communities.

While these qualities are noteworthy, there is another side of Carla Cohen that has been a hallmark of her busy life. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to her commitment to the residents of New York's Fifth Congressional District and her tireless efforts on their behalf.

It is this concern for the general welfare of the community that has led civic leaders in Franklin Square to honor Carla Cohen by appointing her grand marshal of this year's Memorial Day parade. As the first woman in Franklin Square's history to hold this position, she will lead the parade as she has led the community with her words and actions; as a beacon to the principle of caring for one's neighbor.

TRIBUTE TO DR. GERALD J. EASTON

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute and commend a very special member of the optometric profession from Coronado, CA, Dr. Gerald J. Easton.

Since June 1985, Dr. Easton has served as president of the 24,000-member American Optometric Association, culminating years of volunteer work for optometry and eye care at every level. Dr. Easton has also served on the AOA board of trustees since 1978, but his work on behalf of his profession and his patients began years before. He is a past president of both the California Optometric Association and the San Diego County Optometric Society, and has served on the Coronado School Board. For many years Dr. Easton was a consultant to the State of California's Department of School Welfare. It is this commitment to his profession, his patients and his community which has made Dr. Easton such an outstanding leader.

Mr. Speaker, the stated objective of the AOA is "to improve the vision care and health of the public and promote the art and science of the profession of optometry." Dr. Easton has certainly dedicated his career to that objective. I am pleased to join his many friends and colleagues in paying tribute to him, not only for his years as an elected leader of the AOA, but for all his years of service to optometry, the public, and the State of California.

**NUCLEAR SAFETY INSPECTOR
GENERAL ACT OF 1986**

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce today the Nuclear Safety Inspector General Act of 1986, a bill to create an independent Inspector General for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC]. An inspector general is sorely needed at NRC to ensure that the Commission properly implements and enforces all laws and regulations relating to the safety of commercial nuclear power reactors.

Although the NRC has many excellent safety regulations on the books it has grown increasingly complacent about enforcing them. In many cases the NRC has exempted nuclear utilities from complying with crucial safety regulations rather than forcing compliance. At times it seems that the NRC is more concerned with protecting the nuclear industry than protecting public safety.

A typical example of irresponsible regulation by the NRC is their lack of enforcement of regulations concerning reactor operator qualifications. NRC regulations require that applicants for reactor operating licenses at new plants have extensive operating experience at a comparable reactor. Instead of enforcing this important regulation the NRC has simply ignored it.

Knowing that enforcement of reactor operator qualifications could lead to delays in the licensing of some plants the NRC staff interpreted "extensive operating experience" to include "participation in training programs that utilize nuclear powerplant simulators." This blatant misinterpretation of regulations allowed the approval of inexperienced reactor crews to operate the Diablo Canyon, Grand Gulf, and Shoreham reactors. At the time of this decision NRC Commissioner Victor Gilinsky wryly noted, "No one would dream of allowing an aircraft to take off with a new crew that had only had simulator training."

An independent NRC inspector general would provide the oversight necessary to improve NRC safety regulation. The inspector general would have access to all NRC records and documents, the power to subpoena persons and documents, and the ability to refer criminal cases to the Justice Department. The inspector general would be appointed by the President, would have a 4-year term, and

could only be removed by the President for malfeasance or neglect of duty. In order to ensure impartiality the inspector general would be barred from having any financial relationship with the nuclear power industry for 3 years prior to his appointment, and 3 years after leaving office.

NRC safety regulations are one of the many reasons why U.S. nuclear reactors are much safer than Soviet reactors such as the one at Chernobyl. We must do all we can to ensure that these regulations are followed so that the safety of our reactors is maintained and the public is protected. The Nuclear Safety Inspector General Act will provide the oversight necessary to ensure that the NRC effectively enforces its own safety regulations.

**RETIREMENT OF GORDON
HOWARD DRAKE**

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, during my time in the Congress of the United States, one of the greatest pleasures of my job has been working with local officials to resolve problems. I have found that Missourians in my district are well served by local office holders who unselfishly give of their time, energies, and talents.

There are exceptional people even among this outstanding group of public servants. One of these is Gordon Howard Drake, who is retiring following a long, successful term as mayor of Warsaw, MO.

Warsaw has undergone extensive changes during Gordon's tenure because of construction of Truman Dam, located just outside its city limits. Mayor Drake has been a solid leader in helping realize the full benefits of the dam, while working actively and effectively in bringing focus to the trouble spots and getting coordinated action by State, local, and Federal agencies to help solve problems.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to use this forum to commend Gordon Howard Drake for a job well done. His record of leadership and effective public service is one we would all do well to emulate. I feel certain that the Members join me in wishing Mayor Drake all the best in the many years to come.

FREE BUT FAIR TRADE

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I remain committed to the idea of free trade as long as America is not the only country that practices it. In recent years, however, this has sadly seemed to be the case. While staunchly adhering to this concept, the United States has seen an unprecedented trade deficit and has

been unable to compete successfully in the world market.

I have seen the effects of our Nation's current trade policy on my own district, especially as they relate to the steel industry. Earlier this year, the LTV Steel Corp. announced the permanent layoff of nearly 800 workers at its South Chicago plant. Despite many State and local efforts and even after physical remodeling, efficient management and employee wage and benefit concessions, the layoffs took place. Why? Because the domestic steel companies simply cannot compete with inexpensive, subsidized foreign imports dependent on subminimum worker wages.

The Reagan administration has attempted a piecemeal approach to steel imports, projecting only 20.2 percent penetration of the market by foreign sources. But as a result of such an approach, these foreign producers now contribute more than 25 percent of the total steel used in this country. Countries that do not have import agreements with the United States have still been able to export their steel—a situation which certainly undercuts the idea of having these agreements in the first place.

A trade policy that deals with this problem in a comprehensive manner and that faces the general question of fair trade would go a long way in helping America regain its long tradition of competitiveness and productivity. We cannot continue to ignore this issue that is so vital to our Nation's well-being.

**YOSSI STERN: ISRAELI ART
EXHIBITION**

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1986

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I invite you and the Members of this body to an outstanding exhibition of 60 watercolors by one of Israel's best known artists, Yossi Stern.

The exhibit will take place in the Rotunda of the Cannon House Office Building from May 19 to 23. An opening ceremony will be held at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20, in the Cannon Rotunda. At this ceremony you will have an opportunity to meet this great artist.

Stern was born in Hungary in 1923 and arrived in Israel as an "illegal immigrant" in 1939. He studied at Bezalel Academy of Arts in Jerusalem, and has been a professor of art there for 35 years. His drawings, tapestries, watercolors, and oil paintings have been exhibited around the world.

When you look at Stern's work, you will readily see that his watercolors capture the spirit of contemporary Israel while his biblical scenes evoke a sense of joy and contentment.

I hope you will take the time to visit this delightful exhibit being presented in honor of Israel's 38th Independence Day.